

CHAMBERLAIN, RICH, JOCY, MANAGER, PAPER, CHAMBERLAIN

OR, A

SEVERE ENQUIRY

into the late

O NEIROCRITICA

Published here two years ago. The former, by the late Mr. Wallis, who was a learned and accomplished man, and the latter, by the late Mr. Wallis, who was a learned and accomplished man. The former, by the late Mr. Wallis, who was a learned and accomplished man, and the latter, by the late Mr. Wallis, who was a learned and accomplished man. The former, by the late Mr. Wallis, who was a learned and accomplished man, and the latter, by the late Mr. Wallis, who was a learned and accomplished man.

By JOHN WALLIS,

Grammar-Reader in Oxon.

Go tell the Assembly of Divines,

Tell Adoniram blew a

Tell Marshal, Burger, Calf, and Fines,

Tell now and anon too.

Jo. Ashby.

LONDON,

1657

REVERE ENOLOGY

Reader,

THou hast here two Title Pages. He who communicated the former Letter to Mr. *Hobbes*, thought the Doctor for his insolent and contumelious language towards him deserved no other Reply, then to be thus posted: But least the whole work might not be carryed on by the same hand; I thought fit to Joyn with it such a *Title* as the Author himself had prefixed to his Letter.

OR AN
EXACT ACCOVT
OF THE
GRAMMATICAL PART

of the
CONTROVERSY betwixt Mr. HOBBS
and J. WALLIS D. D.

By the Author of the Former Letter.

Stobæus.

Μὴ ταχὺς εἶναι εἰς κείσιν.

Theocrit.

Ἦλθε φίρων ἄλλας ἄμμιν ἀνὴρ τελοκαιδεκάπηγος,
Πάντα νίτεσθι καὶ φικῶ· ἀπο σκανῆς ἀγορεύσων.



LONDON, 1657.

EXACT ACCOUNT

OF THE

ORAMATICAL PART

CONTRACTED between Mr. Hobbes

and Mr. D.D.

By the



THE

THE

LONDON 1657

To the Understanding Reader.

AFTER that the contest betwixt Mr. *Hobs* and our *Geometrician* had alarmed the world, I was requested by a Gentleman of the *Middle Temple* to send up the answer to those *Six Lessons* as soon as it should come out here: I did so, and found my self obliged to give him some account thereof, which I intended should be brief, but after the descant upon his childish *Prosopoeia*, the *Examen* of his *Criticall* remarques drew from me some sheets of paper, of which (I dispatched them, amidst other employments, in three dayes, and never transcribed them) I can give no further account then that the import of my *thoughts* is contained in that extract of a *Letter* published by M. *Hobbes* since, without my being privy thereunto, or acquainted therewith untill it was too late to recall it with civility. Upon a review, I was well satisfied therewith, and with the entertainment it found amongst the *Learned* and *Ingenious*; but I was a little moved, to see my self linked in the same cause with Mr. *Hobbes*. I know his Adversary (it is a sufficient Character to name him) to be JOHN WALLIS D. D. One who hath so merited by his *Scurrility* and *Obscenity*, that his English writings may become *Appendixes* to *Pasquill's Feasts*, or the merry *Tales of Mother Bunch*. There being no name put to the Letter, it might have been answered, and I not concerned: But then he had lost his *rayling accusation*, (*Jud. vers. 9.*) whereunto whatever I shall reply, it is *Responsum non male dictum, quia laesit prior*. I have put my self to the trouble of uncaseing this ranverle of *Alcibiades* his *Sileus*, and let all men see what an Adversary I have. Certainly *Antonio's Nurle* was a discreet Woman! when ever she met any *petite Grammarian*, she would cross her Childe, and repeat those Charms.

which the old Wives of *Sicily* make use of against mad Dogs, least they bite. He calls me *Scribler*; I confesse it was printed in haste: but that is not the Doctors contumely: he is so in love with his own works, that whatever is written either against him, or not after that strain, he esteems it as scribbling: but there are others that do not. Where I said, and that truly, how *Calepine's* Authority should not out-weigh mine, if his reasons did not. He observes that *Ingenium plumbeum est ponderosum*, that he did speak but in jest too! The charge of ignorance amounts to nothing; since he would not acknowledge it himself, he could not but lay it upon me: and I thus far joyn with him, that one of us two is grossly ignorant. *Sarcinest*, I understand not: I know no *betters*, but such as maintain the truth. As for the title of *BOY*, I have so handled the *Professour*, that he may wish he had that plea to excuse himself. But what help could he seek from *personal aspersions*? Must all I say be false, because I was once injured? How come I also to be Mr. *Hobbs's* Journey-man? I was never intreated to this task, much lesse in the pay of four and four-pence a day: if I had (and done nothing) I should have admitted of that residue of ill language SLAVE and Rascal. I would not be mistaken in what I say to this passage: I think the *Scarlet Gown* advantageth not a mans merit, nor is it a certain signe of extraordinary worth: yet I would not at present be understood to detract from it. Neither would I to prosecute my revenge as to prejudice the true Ministers of Christ in the work of the Gospel: I have a real inclination for those who disperse the sincere milk, and do not pester the heads of their flocks, (theirs if they are chosen by them, and with a subordination to the fraternity,) with the burlesque of the Fathers, or jargon of the School-men, (as if we were to go up to the *Philistines* to wheedle our tools, or to fetch our interpretation of the Gospel from those to whom it was hid!) nor urge the *Gallimaufry* of Critical Learning: who deliver what the Spirit attests with their spirit to be the Word of God, & the comfort whereof they have experimented in their daily communion with Christ, not transcribed by a slavish copyist.

To the Understanding Reader.

verse with Books. These I have in all due esteem and regard, and I shall desire to employ my *Talents* in no other way so much as in the promotion of *Christs* cause *under them*. Something about the *Ordinary Ministry* I have said in an account of Doctor *Wallis's Thesis* to a Member of the Army in *Scotland*, which thoughts I have long since enlarged, and put in *Latin*, but could never hear yet that his discourse merited a *censure*: some have thought that his *repute* might give a *greater credit* to the declining cause, then any *Arguments* he had brought, wherein *Generals* are only handled, and nothing *accomodated* to the times: which is the customary procedure of those that intend to *deceive*, not *inform*. But I have here attacqued his *reputation*, and having weakned that in *this present work*, I may well expect the *vacancy* of the Press in *Oxford*, (that the *same place* may publish both discourses) to divulge what I have meditated in order thereunto: wherein I do promise *my self* such an answer to *Matth. 28. 19. 20. Ephes. 4. 11, 12.* (the only material places in the Controversie) that they shall never be produced again *conclusively*. This present work had not been so long delayed, but that it was *long ere* my *occasions*, (which afford still *diversions*) and *long ere* my *laughter* upon the reading *Dr. W.* would permit me the *use* of a Pen: And being then rather to *proclaim* my *victory*, then to *gain* one, I supposed I might take a greater time to prepare for *triumph*, then had been otherwise necessary to the dispute. Nor do I now go about to *triumph* over the *single Doctor*, (the *conquest* is too *mean*!) but over all those whose *interest* or *ignorance* may have lead them to *approve* his *writings*, who are *numerous* at least; and since the *vogue* of the people will have them *deserving* too, I have thought them *worthy* the *passion* of

Oxon. June 17.
1657.

Thy affectionate Friend
and Servant,

Henry Stubbe.

To the Honorable Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., in relation to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which provides for the admission of new States into the Union upon equal terms with the original States.

In reply to inform you that the Department has no objection to the proposed amendment, provided it shall be adopted by the Congress and the people of the United States.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
John C. Calhoun

1948-1949

Oct. 15.

525

2002-2003

ve
we
tha
ha
po
sin
inc
bet
lic
on
tio
ha
say
wi
and
wh
aft
con
I g
far
yo
of
the
no
re
ve
as
spe
ev
ser
no
say

SIR,



Doubt not but you are already sensible of what you have done, and what trouble you have now drawn upon me by communicating my letter to Mr. *Hobbes*. Though I have an entire respect for his person, a great esteem of his *learning*, and honourable resentments for his *civility* at that one visit I gave him, which as vulgar reports had rendered *unexpected*, so it begat in me an opinion that he was one of the most free, and obliging Gentlemen in the world: yet I durst not adventure a line to him by way of censuring his *Antagonist*, lest it might displease those, who would not stick to entitle me to all his *Heterodoxes*, (to which I am so great a stranger, that I know no more of them than common talk hath acquainted me with, having never had leisure to examine his books,) because I agree with him in some few inconsiderable points of *Critical learning*, and make me guilty of his sentiments, because I excuse his *Latine*. With such as think *all manner of correspondence* (which cannot be denied without incivility) with him, to be scandalous; all agreement even in *Philology* transcendently heretical; what can I hope for, but that they repute it *Apostasy* to appear for him in publick? But Sir, for this you are accountable: I wrote a letter to you, you by publishing our *privacies* made it a reply to Dr. *Wallis*: I defended the *Truth*, you made it a vindication of Mr. *Hobbes*: and let me tell you, could he have discovered you, the *TEMPLE* had been no privileged place against the assaults and arrests of our high Priest; you will say there needed no rejoinder, since he hath invalidated nothing I said; but how many will think so besides your self? If *La Taupiniere* doth not overcome, yet he triumphs, and though the book be despicable, yet there wants an *Apology* against the title page, which yet is absurd enough, thorough the *apocryphal* of undoing Mr. *Hobbes's* points, after he had corrected him: *duly!* (but what will not these humble witted souls do to compass a jeast?) Lest you should question my integrity, and suspect henceforth that I go about to impose upon you those things which are not veritable, I have penned a further discourse upon that subject; which you may suppress from going any further, if you find that my early repute abroad doth not call for the publication, nor the applauses of the ingenuous (whose praises were the more to be regarded, because they were directed to the piece which was publick, not the Author, who was concealed) if this doth not deserve it, then you may let it fall, and suffer me (in the opinion of the illiterate) to seem foiled in my first essay. I have enlarged upon particulars, that so I might prevent in the Dr. all possibility of cavilling, and I have observed that conduct in my reply, as to speak not only what the *Drs.* pamphlet, but what the present case required. These spoken the more concerning *adducis malleum*, that so important a business might not be overruled, nor the university debauched in their stile. I was offended at his *Philosophy-fermon*, and reflected upon it in the letter, as no *Apostolick* way of preaching: he doth not remove now that rock of offence, but tells me how I miscite him *stervo*, for he did not say *Sobrius* was but once in Tully, but very often: I trusted to my memory as to what I

heard, (and did not consult the book,) as I told you. I pray remember this exception when you come to that passage; and for what further. That it may more evidently appear how little the Doctour hath been wronged by the Author of the Letter, I shall set down the full words of the Letter, and the whole text it relates to, and then compare the Doctours reply with what hath been objected; and shew that in the Issue he hath been more favourably dealt withal than he deserved, and that it was nothing but the suddainness of the dispatch that occasioned those few, inconsiderable, *perquam* *quædam* which gave the Doctour scope either of triumph for his victories, or complaint for his misallegations. The first place is.

§ 1.

Dr. Wallis: *Longitudinem percursam cum impetu ubique ipsi B. D. æquali*: I said the word *cum* were better out, unless you would have *impetus* to be only a Companion, not a cause: for where a Causality is imported, though we may use WITH in English, yet NOT *cum* in Latine. To kill with a sword (importing this to have an instrumental or causal influence, and not only that it hangs by a mans side, whilst some other weapon is made use of) is NOT in Latine *occidere cum gladio*, but *gladio occidere*? *Soberius vino*; *pallidus ira*, *curvus senectute*, or, if you will, *pra ira*, *ob iram*, &c. not *cum vino*, *cum ira*, &c. You say, it is better in (though for the most part your self leave it out in that construction;) let the reader judge; for it is not worth contending for. All that you say in defence of it, is, that *Impetus* is the Ablative case of the manner. What then? The question remains, as it was before, whether this *Modus* doth not here import a causal influence? And 'tis evident it doth; for the effect here spoken (*that such space be dispatched*) doth equally depend upon two causes; the one, that the motion be uniform, the other, that the *impetus* be so great. And therefore (since you please to insist upon it, which I did but give a touch at by the way) *cum* [is] not proper in either place: but either an Ablative without a preposition; or if you would needs have a preposition, *per*, *pra*, *pro*, *propter*, *ob*, or some other which do import a causality; not *cum*, which imports only a Concomitancy.

LL. The truth is, the Ablative case of the manner, and cause both, may be used with the Conjunction *cum*, as may be justified. Cicero de Nat. deor. l. 2. Sect. 23. *Disium de universo mundo; disium est etiam de fideribus; ut jam propemodum appareat multitudo nec cessantium deorum, nec ea, qua agent, molientium cum labore operoso atque molesto.* And in his Oration for Cæcinnæ Sect. 9. *De se autem hoc prædicat, Antiocho, Æbuti servos, imperasse, ut in Cæcinnam advenientem, cum ferro invaderet.* Let us see then what Dr. Wallis objects against Tully. Where a causality is imported; though we may use *with* in English, yet not *cum* in Latine; to kill with a sword (importing this to have an instrumental or causal influence, and not only that it hangs by a mans side whilst some other weapon is made use of) is not in Latine *occidere cum gladio*, but *gladio occidere*. This shews that the Doctour hath not forgot his Grammar, for the subsequent examples, as well as this rule, are borrowed thence. But yet he might have known that great personages have never confined themselves to this Pedantry, but have chosen to walk in a greater Latitude. Most of the Elegancies and Idioms of every Language are exceptions to his Grammar. But since Mr. Hobbs saith it is the Ablative case of the manner, there is no doubt it may be expressed with *cum*. The Doctour in the meantime knew no more then what Lilly had taught him; Alvarez would have taught him

more. And Vossius in his book *de constructione* cap. 47. expressly teacheth, *Ablativus causa, instrumenti, vel modi, non à verbo regi, sed à præpositione omisâ, à vel ab, de, & vel ex, præ, aut cum; ac præpositiones eas quandoque exprimi; nisi quod cum Ablativis instrumenti haud temerè invenias;* and afterwards he saith of this latter, it is, *haud temerè imitandum.* If this be so, then did Mr. Hobbs speak Grammatically, and with Tully, but not usually. And might not one retort upon the Doctour, that Vossius is as great a Critick as he?

Dr. Wallis replies. To defend you here he brings two places of Tully, and one rule of Vossius; And tells me that Alvarez made a Grammar. But tells me no news all the while; for I knew it all before. I knew that (besides many others) Emanuel Alvarez hath written a Grammar, (which is the same I suppose, with his Alvarez.) And I know not that Orlandus Pescetinus wrote against him: but what then? The two places of Tully I had seen cited in Charles Stephen's *Theaurus Ciceronianus* (from whence he borrowed them.) But I found them not to the purpose: The judgement of Vossius I knew very well from himself, and that it makes nothing against me. The places of Tully do not come home to the business; the Authority of Vossius is against you. In the first place *in liri aliquid cum labore operoso et molesto;* that of *cum labore, &c.* was not intended to define the cause of that endeavour, but only an Adjunct; (and the like of *advenientem cum ferro, &c.*) and if you mean no more here, it was at first allowed you; but not if you meant by *cum* to imply a causality. The rule of Vossius is against you; and so is your own Advocates decision. Vossius tells you *haud temerè invenias,* and if at all, yet *haud temerè imitandum.* And all that your advocate dares affirm in the business is, but a peradventure, [If so] it may be said Grammatically, but not usually.

Defen. That I have not wronged the Doctour I suppose he will here bear me witness; but how he hath wronged me, I leave it to his own conscience, and the judgement of the most partial Reader. He talks high, as one whose reputation is at stake, yet his discourse is so incoherent, inconsistent, that it seems to be the Reserve of a person, who placeth the greatest hope he hath of carrying the case, in his confident manner of speaking. The reader will easily perceive that the Doctour doth pervert the state of the Question, which is, *whether the Ablative case of the manner may have the preposition Cum going before it?* The other Question, *whether the preposition cum may be joyned with the Ablative case of the cause or instrument,* Ought not to beget any dispute, seeing the mentioning of it proceeded from the Doctours not knowing what Mr. Hobbs meant; this is clear. The Doctours exception to *Longitudinem percursum motu uniformi, cum impetu ubique ipsi B. D. aequali, &c.* was, that *Cum* were better out, it being the Ablative case of the cause or instrument: Mr. Hobbs to rectifie his intellectual, tells him it is the Ablative case of the manner. So that whatever can be objected against the Ablative of the cause with *Cum*, it is impertinent to the case in hand; & had not been mentioned by me, but that the Doctour saith, there is the same reason for *cum* when it is joyned with the Ablative of the manner, and instrument; and in this latter case he saith positively, that though we may use in its expressions, *with* in English, yet NOT *cum* in Latin. So that what I objected was directly contradictory to his saying, viz: That in both cases we might make use of the preposition *Cum*. My allegations out of Tully are evident & undeniable, unless the Doctour shew a disparity betwixt *invadere cum ferro;* and *occidere cum gladio.* As for what the Doctour talks of *advenientem cum ferro,* it shews his reading, that he hath not consulted Tully, but Car. Stephanus *Theaurus Ciceroni.* For he that reads the oration will finde that *Cæcina* came without arms, *ex jure manu conserutum,* but his adversary came *non ex jure manu conserutum, sed magis ferro.* I have pointed it here, according to the edition of Janus Gruterus; which I use, that the Doctour may not mistake

take the point in question. And now, if the D. D. Dr. did know this (as he saith he did) let the Reader judge of his impudence to efface the allegation: or if he did not, of his Ignorance in not knowing what he ought to have consulted, before he denied: and whithall he will find what *allowance* is to be made, that the Doctors assertions may be constant, seeing he doth profess he knew all I had said, whereas it is evident he neither knew what I said, nor yet what was the matter in debate; which brings me to examine my second proof, *namque aliquid cum labore operoso et molesto*: If this be not the Ablative case of the manner, I know not what is; and that was all I was to prove, and if this place do not come home to the purpose, I give the Reader leave to Brand me as Ignominiously, as I do the Doctor. That the rule of *Vossius* is against Mr. *Hobbs* is false, for he in the rule grants, and in the examples proves that the Ablative of the manner is governed of the preposition *cum*. What he sayes of the Ablative of the cause, that it is *hanc tenendam*; that doth clearly evince his judgement in the other cases: *Exemplis sunt regulam*: and doth not at all oppose us, who ex abundanti only speake of the Ablative of the cause. This the Doctor knew too! But that the Doctor may learn a little more, I shall adde the judgement of *Jul. Scaliger* in his *appendix ad problemata Gelliana*. Sect. XI.

^a *Quoniam Servius dixit Septimum casum (Quintilian as well as Servius accounts the Ablative of the instrument to be the seventh case) cum prepositionis nota poni, quando instrumentum significat? Quod Priscianus aliquo modo voluisse videtur cum dicit: desunt verò interdum prepositiones, his magnum Alciden contra stetit. An quod ex arte loquutus est; et ex antiquis aliquos habebat quos adduceres, qui nostro favore sunt intercepti?*
^b Non adduxerim in re manifestâ et in controversâ testes non necessarios: et non adducimus *Ovid. 4. Fastor. adversus calumniatores.*

Hæc modo verberbat raro cum pectine pratum.

Franciscus Sanctius also saith as to that very case, de *caus. lingu. Lat. lib. 4. c. de instrumenti prepositionibus. In instrumentis significando desit Cum, Græcè. Sicut. Sed ubi tanta ambiguitas gratia non colligitur. Quam enim dicit terigi illum cum habet; nequit, an illum et hastam terigeris, an verò instrumentum significet. Sed ubi dubia non est oratio, venuste apponitur: ut, vidi gladium, CUM quo se percussit. *Ovid. 2. Metam. Conculsit Têrque quaterque.**

Cæsariem, cum quâ terram, mare, sidera movit.

^a *Idem in Epistol. Aemilii.*

Techis et Astæon, quondam fera creditis illis,
 Ipse dedit lecto cum quibus ante feras.

^a *Idem 4. Fastor.*

Hæc modo verberbat raro cum pectine pratum.

^a *Aldus aliter emendavit, quod non probo. Plin. libro 9. c. 28. Ceteri cirri cum quibus venantur. Sic habet antiquus textus. Paul. Orosius l. 7. Ipse imperator cum sagitta functus. ut. Et quid elegantius quâp illud non incultis Authoris (gladium, quicum se percussit, eduxit:) quod imperitê clama Valla lib. 2. c. 6. The book hath an high esteem amongst learned men, and the transfer (no mean person) gives it this commendation, esse enim quæ, unde hujus artis Grammatici, (si tandem aliquando serio sapere velint) vera, brevia, clârâque præcepta discere possunt. What the Doctor shall say for elevating his Authority, I believe will justify me in what I did against *Cæpæ*; he will answer out of *Vossius* (in the place alledged before) his proofes, and then his assertion must be countervailed with *negation*. And (that the reader may not be ignorant) it was *Franciscus Sanctius* whom *Vossius* (without naming him) answers there; and having*

ving replied to the proofs out of the ancients, 'by reading the places otherwise, or expounding them in a different sense; he proceeds no further, but (reflecting I suppose upon *Orosius*, and that other eminent writer taxed very peremptorily by Valla l. 2. c. 6,) concludes, *Negue, si aliter assiam asperetur, tunc licet imitari*. But how hard *temere imitandum*, comes to be construed, *not to be used in Latine*, I do not understand. I should have glossed upon it otherwise, and thought it a prohibition not of the use absolutely, but frequently; as in the case of him who imitating *Salust*, because he had found *Hieronymus* (or the like once) be inculcated that expression upon all occasions: this was *temere imitari Antonius Nabrigensis* in his Grammar lib. 4. *Ablativus Cause, Excessus, aut medi, quod aliquid sit, omnibus verbis adjungitur, qui semper præterit a propositione*. *Tersen. And, Hisce oculis egomet vidi, &c. CAUSÆ, Excessui, aut MODO eleganter sæpe propositionem constituit: Instrumento non ita eleganter*. It is not long since this Grammar was as Authentick in Spain, as *Lilly* is in England, (out of whose rules Doctor *Wallis* confutes us) and whether he be so still I cannot tell, I know nothing to the contrary: I finde good writers to praise him, and if the Doctor produce more Grammars against us, I will allow him two to one, and venture my reputation against his *no credit*; though all this be nothing to the controversy, which is about the *Ablative* of the manner, which I have proved to be good Latine, and (if the Doctor please) elegant also. He saith, *Tell him Alvarez* (betwixt which and *Em. Alvarez*, there is no other difference then that of *Wallisius* and *Wallis*) made a Grammar. Good reader dost thou finde any such impertinency, in the Letter? I say *Alvarez* would have taught him more: and it is true, for *Alvarez* saith, *Modus actionis propositionem, Cum, interdum desiderat*. And is this no more then to tell him *Alvarez* did write a Grammar? I believe indeed that was all the Doctor knew of him, but no man could think that was all I meant; though writing in haste, I did not cite his words. Who that *Orlandus Pescetius* is, I do not know, but had he in his writings produced any thing that might avail the Doctor here, I doubt not but he would have alledged it. The Advocates decision is not against Mr. *Hobs*, but for him; I shall never censure any man for using *Cum* with an *Ablative* of the manner: nor yet if he use it once (or so) with an *Ablative* of the instrument; (and more you do not object to Mr. *Hobs*) because I finde it in *Tully*. *Cum uno Cicero errare malo, quam cum illis sapere*. He saith, all that the Advocate dare as a firm in the business, is, but a *P E R A D V E N T U R E* (if so) it may be said Grammatically, but not usually. Was there ever any man guilty of such horrid falsification? If so! It is *Ratiocinantis*, not *Dubitantis*. Could ever any man force such a remark out of these words, If this be so, then did Mr. *Hobs* speak Grammatically, but not usually; but you proceed.

And therefore say I, (as I said before) it were better out! This is not all good Doctor, you said it could not be in: as is evident, and that not only where the case was of the manner but Instrument also. Your reason why it were better out, being, because it could not be in. And now you see, that you have afforded us nothing hitherto but *falsities*, and *falsifications*, *ὅπως ἔδειξαι*.

§ 2.

The next passage is concerning *Præterit scire*.

Dr. W. Fourthly, you say, (i. e. Mr. *Hobs*) that you think, I did mistake (*præterit scire*) for an *Anglicisme*. Your words were these at first, (as that Paragraph was

'was first printed, pag. 176.) *tamen quia tu id nescis, nec prætendit scire præterquam re
 'auditu, &c.* as appears in the torn papers. And then (after you had modelled the
 'whole paragraph, as it now is pag. 174.) *tamen quia id nescit, nec prætendit scire,
 ' &c.* This I did, and do still take (not mistake) for an *Anglicisme*. And you cannot
 'deny but that it is so. Where is the mistake then? You say it is a fault in the Impres-
 'sion; yes that it is, and that twice. But was it not a fault in the copy itself?
 'You say it should have been, *prætendit se scire*. That I confess helps the matter a lit-
 'tle. But why was it not so? The printer left out *se* (yes, at both places!) And why?
 'But because the Author had not put it in?

L. Lr. His next reflection is upon *prætendit scire*; this he saith is an *Anglicisme*. If
 'this be all his accusation, we shall lose upon this score many expressions that are used
 'by the best Authors, which I take to be good Latin ones, though they be also *Angli-
 'cismes*, the latter being but an imitation of the former. The Doctor therefore was
 'too fierce to condemn upon to general an account, that which was not to have been
 'censured for being an *Anglicisme*, unless it also had been no *Latinisme*. Mr. Hobbs re-
 'plies, that the Printer had omitted *se*. He saith, this mends the matter a little. It
 'is very likely, for then it is just such another *Anglicisme* as that of *Quintilian*; *Cum lo-
 'ricatus in foro ambularet, prætebat se id meru facere*. The Doctor certainly was very
 'negligent, or else he could not have missed this in *Robert Stephen*. Or haply, he was
 'resolved to condemn *Quintilian* for this and that other *Anglicisme*, *Ignorantia prætendi
 'non potest*; as also all those that have used *prætendo*, which are many, and as good Au-
 'thors as Dr. Wallis who makes his own *Encomiast* (not an English man) amongst them
 'to write *Anglicismes*.

Dr. W. repl. The next is *prætendit scire*, which I took to be no great elegance. You
 'suppose that I took it for an *Anglicisme*; and I confessed I did. Your defence was,
 'that it should have been *prætendit se scire*, (thereby confessing, I suppose, that with-
 'out *se* it was not good,) but that *se* was omitted in the impression (twice for fail-
 'ing.) Your Advocates defence is, that *prætendo* is a good Latin word (as though
 'any had questioned it) why did he not bring the same for *Cum* in the former place?
 'For doubtless that is a good Latin word too. The earliest defence had been, in both
 'places, as well as one, to put it upon the Printer; (in the one place he put in *cum*,
 'which were better out; in the other he left out *se*, which should have been in:) or
 'else, that it was but the *stumbling of an hasty pen*, which had been excuse enough, and
 'would have passed without any more ado.

What the Doctor said in his *Elenchus* I have not the book to see; yet I fear he mi-
 'stakes the terms no great elegance, and an *Anglicisme*! An *Anglicisme* may be a very great
 'elegancy: and I think the Doctor did not do well in a Philosophical discourse to con-
 'demn phrases for not being great elegancies: but surely he took it for a *Barbarisme*; up-
 'on the former account he must seem impertinent, and on the latter score, ignorant.
 'In the construction of these two words, I imagined that his quarrel lay against the verb
 '*prætendo*, to pretend, (and he I think must confess it, for the infinitive mood without
 'an Accusative case before it, as here *Se* was omitted, is frequent in Latin Authors, e-
 'ven in *Tully*) hereupon I said *prætendo* was a good word in that sense, and proved it.
 'But that I said simply that *prætendo* was a good Latin word, without any relation to its
 'English signification, is a thing imposed upon me by the Doctor, that so he might
 'seem to reply something, though he said nothing. What the printer might leave out,
 'the Doctor will tell us anon in his own case; if he expect any favour, he must learn
 'to allow more. You have had enough concerning *Cum*, and it is as easie for a printer
 'to leave out *se*, (in my poor conceit) as *He* would have us credit him concerning the
 'graver. If he had acknowledged it the *stumbling of an hasty pen*, the Doctor would
 'hardly

hardly have let it pass, who will not let alone other passages that are not such. Let any body compare both, and see to what the Doctor answers. The mention of his Encomiastes, who is a publick Professour of Mathematicks, of known abilities, and beyond exception, obliges me to present the reader with some part of his Latin letter: I am very charitable to think the Doctor did alter some of his Solacisms, yet as it is after it hath passed both their hands, I here tender it.

Cum astate præteritâ in manus inciderit *Thoma Hob's elementorum philosophia Sælio prima*: abstinere non potui quin tractatum istum leviter evoluerim. Instigabat me ad hoc, tum Authoris hujus celebritas, tum etiam quod plura in eodem tractatu offendebam Geometrica, quam si Philosophiam non excolerent, saltem ut quàm maximè illustratura f'rent, opinabar. Sed me illum perlustrante, cum talia ibi invenerim ejus de Algebra à frue Analyfi judicia, & quibus mihi facile fuit colligere, quod Author hic in eadem arte parum deberet esse versatus: (quandquidem hac illa Ars existit, ut si liber sum in Geometriâ egregiè ac arduè quid contineret, qualia se passim invenisse *P R Æ T E N D E R E* mihi videbatur, id ipsum huic arti, judicio meo, intotum deberet;) Cùmque adhuc in perlustrando dum pergebam, nonnulla de rella ac curva aequalitate, aliâque complura animalivertebam quorum cognitionem nunquam mihi pollicebar ac inter seponenda notabam, vel certè si spes aliquâ inventendi illa mihi superesset, quin Algebra in partes vocarem non dubitabam: Aliam excude de ipso opinionem concepi, credens quod illi quæ illum ante & proprio penu deprompsisse autumabam, non nisi aliorum inventa esse, sed ignatum sensum ab eo traducta aut corrupta: Ideoque siquid boni in eis comprehenderetur, id quàm maxime esse ventilandum ac excutiendum.

Here is such a promissus out of Dutch-land, as I have not the patience to transcribe any more: If the Doctor will excuse him, he must stie to Tullies *Epistol. nostra debent hallucinari*. He that had exhibited to us such a letter, might have spared the *stumbings of a contemplative minde* in a large treatise. This man the Doctor says needs not Mr. Hob's praise: If he did, I believe he would not obtain it: he gives not praises to them that stand in need, but which deserve them. If he have no better ornaments then we see here, (that I may use the *Scarlet Doctors* phrase) the *ragged regiment* will scarce allow him the benefit of a *muster*. Mr. Hob's called him *Duns*: the Doctor hints us out an Apology for him, (p. 10.) viz. that *Duns* should not be written with an S. well now that I have exhibited the letter, do as you see fit. *Minshew* (from whence I may as well say you have plundered the Etymology of *Hob-gobbing*, as you charge me with *Nigolius*, &c.) saith it comes from *densus*: and then it may be *Duns*; (with an S.) the e being wanting is a *Dugardisme*. When I read it I think there may be an allusion to his name, which having some affinity with *Scotus*, he firnamed him *Duns*. But I go on.

§ 3.

Dr. W. In like manner Page 222. *Tractatus hujus partis tertia, in qua motus et magnitudo per se et abstractè consideravimus, terminum hic statuo.* This was the *Prin.* *ters* fault too, was it not? Or at least a fault in the impression?

Lr. Here I must confess the exception is colourable, yet I can parallel it with the like objection made by *Erasmus* against *Tully*, out of whom *Erasmus* quotes this passage: *Dimitti commorans Athenis; quoniam venti negabant solvendi facultatem, erat animus ad te scribere*: and excuses it thus, that *Tully* might have had at first in his thoughts *volebam*, or *statuebam*, which he afterwards relinquished for *erat animus*, and did not remember what he had antecedently written, which did not vary from his succeeding *thoughts*.

'thoughts, but words. And this excuse may pass with any who knows that Mr. Hobbes values not the study of words, but as it serves to express his thoughts, which were the same whether he wrote, *in quâ motus & magnitudo per se et abstractè considerati sunt*, or *consideravimus*. If the Doctor will make this so Capital, he must prove it voluntary, and also shew that it is greater than what is legible in the puny letter of his *Encomiast*, whom he must have to be *beyond exception*.

Dr. W. repl. And the same defence (*viz.* that they were the *stumbleings of an hasty pen*) should have been made for the third and fift place; *motus et magnitudo consideravimus: et multa ejusmodi (propositiones)* for to defend such mistakes, is worse then to commit them. And the like of many other elegancies, of which I gave you a taste the last time, which now are passed over in silence. And it would not have hurt you to have said as little of these. Such slips are no great blemish till they come to be defended. And I should not have thought it worth while, so much as to note them, if you had not in a manner challenged me so to do.

Def. That these were not the *stumbleings of an hasty pen* in Mr. Hobbes, I cannot say: if he had acknowledged it; how the Doctor would have passed over *his faults*, whereas he maketh such adoe concerning the *printers Errata*, any one may conjecture, what I wrote in the letter, I wrote not as if it had been the *rule* he proceeded by, but *excuse*. And what more might have been said, for those that I passed by, let the reader judge by what I have said, and shall say for these. I cannot allow the Doctor that *TO DEFEND SUCH MISTAKES IS WORSE THEN TO COMMIT THEM*, greater men then I are concerned in this: the reader sees that *Tully* and Mr. Hobbes are in the same condition, whatever then hath been said for the one, may justifie the other (*mutatis mutandis*) and what the Doctor objects against the Apologist for Mr. Hobbes, will interest the Advocates of *Tully* in the controversie. It is not one, but several *Solecismes* that *Erasmus* carpeth at in *Tully*. I shall set down *Jul. Scaliger*s defence (though it be long, it cannot be tedious to the diligent reader) in gross, not omitting things remote from the present controversie, because the Oration is hard to be got, and contains very remarkable things. Thus then *Julius Scaliger* speaketh to his supposed auditors, concerning *Erasmus*.

Solecismos in Ciceronis scriptis deprehensos tradit etiamne id nebulo? Quis tibi dixit ita scriptum esse? Nihil enim est quod à maledicentissimo, eodémque mendace non imponi possit. Quasi verò non aequè invidi atque inepti sit, ita scriptum suspicari reliquisse, et candidi ingenii in libranorum culpam rejicere. Quanto facilius mihi fidem habebunt omnes temporum injuriam accusanti, cujus tractibus atque anfractibus, multa latent, multa inveniuntur, plurima depravantur, alia intereunt. Nolo enim hic tractare hunc locum, quasi communem, deplorareque sæculorum acerbitatem; neque si velim, sciam, sed tu ipse qui hæc Tragædias movere soles, qui nequaquam integro nobis Cicerone per tempestatum injurias frui licere clamitas, qui supposititious atque adulterinos libros sub ejus nomine falsè circumferri indignaris; quid hoc est negotiū, ut calumniam istam de uno verbo, immò verò de unius verbi syllabâ motueris? Quid iniques, si contendam aliter à Cicerone scriptam fuisse, quid tū unde ea desumpisti? Quid si jam dormitantis manum Tyronis accusem? Sed ut hæc omnia omittam, quæro de te num tu Ciceronem prima Grammaticæ rudimenta nescisse dicas? Id verò est, quod à veteribus dici solet, nihil esse perniciosius arrogante homine, cum ei semel anfractibus præbita est ad calumniam. Ageita sit, in libris Ciceronis vel illius ipsius manuscriptorum Solecismos deprehensus est. Hic verò scire pervelim, ubi gentium tam imperus veterator vitam vivat, qui illi id adscribere audeat. Sed non mirum est te id improbare quod tibi incompertum est, cum multo majore impudentiæ recepta quoque retrahere studeas.

studeat. *In potestatem esse à Cicerone dictum, inquit, atque id idiom.* *Et id idiom.* Latinum quibudam visum esse. At scin quibus? Barbaris aliquot, as-
 re rudi atque agresti, iudicio corrupto, quorum ineptia neque abs te *defectum in pro-*
 primò referuntur, neque à me primò resciluntur: sed sunt nobis aucto-
 res multo quàm Cicero antiquiores, quibus à Græcis fontibus ea ita deducere placuit.
 Quam rem quoniam à polittimo auctore Gellio Iuveniter tractatur, diffusius non oc-
 cupabo. Sed quoniam admodum Q. Claudius *in medium relinquere dixit, quemadmodum*
in rem esse Latine dicimus, *in re esse* pro eo quod est uile esse, non dicimus, sed *re esse*;
 atque alia eundem in modum apud alios inuenta: ita esse *in potestatem*. A. L. U. D. enim
 est Semiliteratorem esse, qualis tu, cujus in angustias sordescere nos detrudere vis; a-
 liud populi consuetudini, doctorum auctoritati, numeris orationis, purgatis auribus
 inservire. Quamobrem ab eodem Gellio qui hoc te docuit ex calumniatoribus, si tam
 candidus esles tu, quàm ille vir bonus fuit ac doctus, defensionem quoque mutari de-
 buisses.

Marcus Tullius vocem *piissimus*, inquit (*Erasmus*) tanquam barbaram proscindit, quâ
 multi probati auctores usi sunt. At Cicero id inter eos viros vitio vertebat, qui neque
 tunc reclinarunt. Ex quorum consensu semel assertum, quod dixisset, postea pro bono
 probatque agnovit. Nec si eâ voce usi sunt ii, qui tibi probi videntur, contumeliam tan-
 quam Barba à toto Senatu rejici non debet; sed tu illis qui tuo permissu eâ voce usi
 sunt, quoniam similem tui vocem amplecteris, assentiris; Cicero qui totius Senatûs
 consensu, totius spe posteritatis eandem ignominiam notavit, dissimili tui auctori non
 assentiris.

Facere contumeliam, inquit, Latine dicitur, at id Cicero quasi non probè dictum
 taxatur. In Eunuchio namque Terentianâ Thais ita loquitur. *Nam si ego digna hac con-*
tumeliâ sum maximâ, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen: Opinor, inquit, tacite reperi *con-*
tumeliam, Mitificum sibi facinus fecisse videtur, si eandem vocem alteri verbo reddide-
 rit. At id etiam pueri sciunt, quod si tam præstantis esles memoria, quàm acerbi ani-
 mi es, si observationes non irritiffes, non tantopere nunc laborares. Quare non agam
 tecum inimicè sed humaniter eo labore te levatum meâ opèrâ volo. Audistine unquam
 ex oratione Catonis, quam pro se contra C. Cassium habuit ea verba? *Atque evnit ita*
Quirites, ut in hac contumeliâ, quâ mihi per hujusce petulantiam fastidimur. Ex Plauti i-
 tem Asinaria poteras hunc servum excitare, cujus testimonium futile atque ineptum
 hoc in iudicio putare non debuisti, qui istâ tuâ tragadiâ Davum agis. Is igitur servus
 ita loquitur: *Tu alteri contumeliam facias, tibi non dicam?* Eo quanto beneficio meo
 uteris, qui te tam multa doces, quæ aut nullo modo noveris, aut perperam didiceris,
 aut turpiter oblitus fueris; Te tantâ in calumniâ deficientem excitò, collapsum suble-
 vo, tantum abest ut tua ista venena pertimescam. Quamobrem tot tantâque doctus,
 id quoque à me doceri debes, Cicronem non id rejecisse tanquam nemo unquam sic
 locutus fuerit, sed quod tunc ista nemo loqueretur. Non enim dicit, *Quis sic un-*
quam locutus est? Sed *quis sic loquitur?* Idem porro visum est et inaudita, et obsoleta
 loqui. At ita evenit ut quod tantâ ætatis illius auctoritate desitum erat, tu pari ar-
 gantia instaurare coneris. Nam enim quæcumque veteres *IMPOLITIVS* dixissent,
 statim ab eâ elegantissimâ ætate recepta sunt. Et cum idem Catò, idem Plautus vul-
 tis dicendi formulis usi essent, id *CASTIORES* linguæ haudquam sibi licere
 voluerunt. Quod ut apertius cognoscas, vel ex Terentianis elocutionibus amplius in-
 telligere est, quarum quasdam quamlibet puri auctoris, nè probamus quidem. Non
 enim post illum quispiam oratorum dixit, tibi, aut mihi *decere*, quod quidem extet:
 quâ dicenti tamen formâ ille usus est, Neque multa alia quæ ne subsidium pariamus
 aponere superfluebo.

A voce *novissimæ* et *novissimis*, inquit, abstinuit Cicero, quibus vocibus Salustium optimum authorem, & M. Catonem usos ferunt. Etiamne id vitium, ac non prudentiam Ciceronis dicit? Eum hominem qui Latinam linguam tantâ curâ illustrare studeret, *novissimam* vocem formidare prudentiz fuit; prolata autem sententiâ non damnare, quâ ceteri crederentur, modestia. At quare non securus est Cicero tantorum virorum iudicium? Quare? Quia maluit solus culpâ carere, quàm cum cæteris veniam poscere. Quia maluit Latium sequi, cujus iudicio ea vox damnata esset; cujus iudicio qui loquebantur, rectè loqui putabantur: cujus iudicium maluit sequi Cicero, quàm contra illud mereri, ut se sequeretur. Aliud enim sonat auribus suis improbo nunc verbo assuetis, Erasme, aliud Romano viro, qui tamen Asinianæ calumniæ Patavinatatem Livio obestare ausus es, quàm tu quo loco, quo tempore cognoscere, quo modulo Catavus medicari potes? Quâ ratione Teutonicus vitium illud constari, quo iudicio dignosci dices? Si omnes voces Romanæ sunt, si universa structura ex veterum cements, lapidibus redivivis, incorruptâ materiâ constet, si candor ille illam felicissimam ætatem etiam superat, si omni invidiâ, omni calumniâ major est, quàm in lacteo flumine labem *labes* deprehendas? Cum tamen illius sententiæ ne his quidem qui objecerat, cæteros Romanos habuerit assertores.

I have taken the pains to transcribe all this, that the reader may see what entertain-ment Erasmus his *Ciceronianus* found in the world, and also because there are in it several things that may have a great influence upon some passages, which will hereafter be debated betwixt the Doctor and my self: I thought it therefore much more convenient to present you with the whole paragraph, then to detract any thing from so exquisite a piece, by retailing it in parcels. Another that hath made an Apology for *Salustianus* in *Stephanus Deletus*, an exact imitator of *Tully*, and to whom the Latin tongue (notwithstanding what can be said to his disparagement) is very much beholden. He in his reply to Erasmus upon the same account, videl: quod erudit non negant in Ciceronis Scriptis inveniri Solacismos inexcusabiles, *QUALES* et olim exciderunt, et excidunt hodie viris multum doctis, dum in variis res distractis cogitatione, magis sententiæ precedentis meminerint, quàm verborum, eoque sit, ut periodi clausula prioribus non respondeat. Quod genus sit. *Diutius commemorans Athenis, quondam venti negabant solvendi facultatem, erat animus ad te Scribere, &c.* *VIL*: vulgare est, cuique esse linguæ multas loquendi formas, quæ duriores videantur, & omnibus Grammaticorum regulis normisque solute, quas si legibus et præceptionibus adstringas, linguæ illius dignitatem vires, et vim libertati adfers. *EO* loquendi genere si Romanè ut Romanis, usus est modicè Tullius, id ne ut vitiosum animadvertendum duces? Ann ista Romanos domi inter loquendum usurpassè dubitas, quæ Scriptis elata, posteri ab illâ ætate remotiores, asperiora iudicant? Quorum nulla constet ratio, sed in usu tantum et loquendi consuetudine fuisse posita. Romanè itaque scribens Tullius verbum prior sententiæ non addidit: *Erat animus ad te scribere dixit.* Piaculum hoc parat Erasmus publicis supplicationibus expandum?

This he saith by way of defence of what I alledged against Doctor Wallis; and whereas Sir Th. More in the dialogue objects again.

Ciceronem dixisse quædam, quæ nemo doctus putavit imitanda: veluti in potestatem esse, pro in potestate esse. Rursus in editio M. Antonii M. Tullius veluti Barbaram et Latinam inauditam vocem prociudit, *pissinus*: à ph, cum ea apud probatissimos linguæ Latine Scriptores reperitur. Idem ut Solon in eo reprehendit, quod Scripsisset, *facere constitutionem*, idem ab his vocibus *novissime* et *novissimus*, ceu male Latinis abstinentis, cum eis non veriti sint uti M. Cat. & Salustius. *VIII*: Libenter, unde aliquis invadit fluxu ostenditur, velut dat Erasmus, clausum in Ciceronem instruit, atque idoneam nactus tempestatem, prout et puppi totum se ad obsecrationem rapit, Tullii navem veluti

veluti ad barbarici Scopulum allisam videt. Dixit Cicero (inquit) multa qua nemo doctus putat imitanda, veluti cum ait in potestatem esse. Tam vincti maledant. More, qui potestatem pro potestate, descripserunt, quod ridiculus est Erasmus, qui hac minutula confectatur, librorum negligentia orta, non a Cicerone profecta. At in M. Antonio edicto, piissimus a pio tanquam barbaram vocem non satis recte notat, quod probatissimè lingua Latina Scriptores frequentem. Idem hunc loquendi modum imitandi reprehendit, sacra contumeliam: quâ locutione nî non veritus est Terentius: novissimè quoque et novissimam nimium religiose fugit. PIISSIMVS, facere contumeliam, novissimè, novissimus, si veluti partim barbara, partim ut nova et dura vitavit Cicero, non hoc certè temere. Neque mehercule mihi persuasero, ut, quæ tolerabilia novissè, es in Senatu coram lingue Latine principibus, tanquam barbara & Latina hominibus ignota reprobaretur. QVIS Ciceronis ingenium usque adeo ignorat, ut, quorum reprehensione, in reprehensionis periculum venisset, ea illum reprehendere voluisse arbitratur? Sequitur, ut quare à novissimè et novissimus abstinerit, paucis ipse audias, et illum verborum delectu sapienter usum, non religione vitiose abusum cognoscas. In Italia, in Gallia, in Britannia, in Hispania. vel in quavis etiam urbe, pervagata multa verba, multosque loquendi modos esse sape intelligas, quos elegantius expidiores, aut ut duos & malè proprios, aut ut recenter sotos, aut ut insolitos et venustate carentes negligunt. Sic prorsus multas quondam Romæ percrebuisse voces non ambigo, plebi et rudi multitudini gratas, oratoribus et exactiori aurium iudicio viris non continuò arridentes: quas, si Catonum obsoleto dictionis peramantem, aut si Salsitum audacem verborum architectum opificemque imitemur, non rejiciemus: si Tullium locutionis mundæ et puræ observantissimum et undique splendentem sequemur, veluti facem, aut ex lacuna aliqua erutas sordes, respiciamus.

You have here the defence of two learned men (as learned as Dr. Wallis) for Tully; and you see what pains they take to commit a worse error, then that is which they defend. I should not say any more, but that the Doctor hath misrepresented me to that honourable personage in the dedication of his Pamphlet, as if I had said *motus & magnitudo consideravimus* were true Latine. That I said no such thing, the letter doth bear me witness, yet this I shall say; it being debated by the Popes legate at Paris concerning the introduction of the *Infants* of Spains title against that of H. 4. (I may mistake in the History) one opposed the *Salique Law* to her plea. The legate demanded where that law was to be found? The other suddainly replied, upon the back side of the donation of Constantine to Pope Sylvester. So I say that (if we may believe H. Stephens Criticis) *motus & magnitudo consideravimus*, is to be found written upon the back of that verse in Virgil, *Æneid. l. 2.*

Cui mater media sese tulit obvia sylva
Virginis os habitumque gerens.

Latine lingue consuetudo poscit ut dicatur, *illa tulit se ei obviam*: Quo modo igitur hoc Cui mater sese tulit obviam à Latinitate non discedere dicemus? Nam ineptum quidem (meo iudicio) fuerit illud *obvia* à verbo *tulit* separare; hoc modo, Cui mater *obvia* (id est veniens obviam) *se tulit*. Quid n. hoc est? Aut ubi lectum? *ferre se dicunt*. Non video certè quod ex hoc loco pateat effugium, nisi ut dicamus *tulit se* dictum esse pro *obtulit*. Sed quamvis simplicibus pro compositis utantur poete, esse tamen nonnulla constat, quorum talis usus nimium insolens et durus esset; nec dubito quin hoc in numero ponendum sit istud. Alterum exemplum peto ex *Æneid. 12. Talis se fata nosse tulit*. Nam si *talem se fata nosse tulit*, scribendum dixerò, hoc ex aliis locis facile mihi existurus videor. But what if I had said it had been a *Græcism*? And said the like had been frequent amongst them.

est, truciſſimis verbis odioſiſſima exagineris. There is also one *Petrus Alkyonius* who wrote a book *de exilio*, (wherein he shewed to what an height of eloquence a genuine imitation might bring us at present) I do finde him amongst his other elegancies to have let fall this affectedly negligent passage. *Finem* (aiebat Hannibal) *faceret Antiochus sperandi, se Asiam pacatam et tranquillam habiturum, sed potius cogitaret, de illo Imperio, propediem cum Romanis certandum sibi esse terra marique; et aut illis Imperium orbis terrarum presumptibus eripendum: aut vicum et regni possessione cedentem, accipiendam: quasunque pacis conditiones victor hostis dedisset.*

Thus much I have chosen to say upon this point, that the *Grammar* reader may see how valid his rules are, how little need there was of that excuse he suggests, and how many are concerned in that absurdity he so exaggerates against me, for defending *Solecism*, though I did only excuse an ordinary *αὐθαλαδία* in Greek. Let the Doctor take notice of what I have now said, hereafter, and if in any thing that shall proceed from me he chauce to finde some places paralel to what I have produced out of *Tully*, *Homer*, &c. I shall never secure my self against his rules by excuse of haste, but without fear of shame acknowledge it *VOLUNTARY*.

As for that *ſale* ſunt — *Et multa ejuſmodi (propositiones)* I do ſtill wonder that ever he ſhould think that to be unuſual: I brought him that place in the beginning of *Tullies* paradoxes, *Animadverti ſepe Catonem, cum in Senatu ſententiam diceret, locos graves in Philoſophia trahere, abhorrentes ab hoc uſu forenſi et publico, ſed dicendo conſequi tamen, ut illa etiam populo probabilia viderentur.* The Doctor excepts not againſt the place, he doth not ſhew that *locus* is ever taken for a common place when it is of the neuter gender plural: I referred him to another paſſage in *Acad. Quæſt. l. 2. An tu, cum res oculiſſimas aperueris, in lucemque protuleris, iuratiſque es ea te comperiſſe (quod mihi quoque dicebat, qui ex te illa cognoveram) negabis eſſe rem ullam, qua cognosci, comprehendī, percipi poſſit?* Many more examples might have been produced, but I thought it needed not: neither do I think it now very neceſſary, but only to reflect upon the Doctor the more. Had not thoſe *Grammarians*, who are, as I may phrase it with the eloquent *Mr. Milton*, *bonis Authoribus tranſcribendis et diverſandis nati*, varied the text, *Plautus* would have furniſhed us with a multitude of examples, wherein the *Subſtantive* and *Adjective* had not agreed in gender, as *canus intro, non atibile [now utilis] hic locus ſalis tuis*: and the like, which thoſe petty critics have altered. But in the like caſe to that of *Mr. Hobs*, 'tis common. *Hoc pectus omne meum eſt; multa ſtabulant in antro.* So *Ovid*.

*Crescant arbuſta, et ſatus in tempore fundus,
Quod cibus in totas uſque ab radicibus imis,
Per truncos ac per ramos diffunditur omnes.*

Several of the like examples are produced and defended by *Giphanius* upon *Lucretius* in *Colleſtan. gener. mutat.* not only out of Poets, but *Varro*. In any ſentence where the ſubſtantive of one gender hath a *Synonymous* word of another, the adjective: (not eothering immediately, but following at a diſtance) may agree either with it, or it's *Synonym*, as in particular here *multa* may agree with *proloquia*, *enunciata*, *diſta*, and not with *propositiones*, as *Scelus poſtquam indifcatus eſt virginem. Ubi ille ſcelus eſt, qui me perdidit?* *Scaliger. exercit. 319. Euclida theoremata reducenda ſunt ad pauciores.* And without doubt in that piece of *Scaliger* may be found affectedly uſed all (or moſt) of thoſe *Solecismes* which the Doctor cenſureth in *Mr. Hobs*. I finde in very good judges of the Latin tongue theſe things propoſed as imitable, *populo ut placent quas feciſſes fabulas. Cuius mos eſt conſimilis veſtrum, hi ſe ad vos applicant, &c. Omnes repudiandum eſt artes. Veſtri adhortandi cauſa: atiquod fuit principium generandi animalium.* Theſe and

and the like I shall not decline occasionally (not frequently) to make use of, and give the Doctor that advantage, which he hath not in this case, that he may say they were out of *affection*.

I shall leave the order of the Letter at present, and pursue the Doctors method, according to which, the next passage to be debated is *Tanquam diceremus*.

D^r. Wallis. I might adde that of *tanquam diceremus*, (as if we should say) and *tanquam posset*, and elsewhere, instead of *acsi*, *quasi*, (or some such word) or *tanquam si*, which is Tullies phrase, (*tanquam si tua res agatur, tanquam si Consul esset, tanquam si clausa esset Asia*) for *tanquam* without *si*, signifies but *as*, not *as if*: but because I know you are not the first that have so used it, of modern writers; and that even of the antients, some of them do sometimes leave out *si*, I shall allow you the same liberty, and pass this by without blame (as passable, not accurate.)

L^r. Now he disallows *tanquam diceremus*, as if we should say. But why is that less tolerable than *tanquam feceris*, as if you had done. It should be *quasi* (forsooth!) or *ac si*, or *tanquam si*, which is Tullies own word, (what is *tanquam si* become but one word?) *Tanquam si tua res agatur*, &c. Good Doctor leave our Tully and all Ciceroians, or you will for ever suffer for this, and your *adducis malleum*. Is not this to put your self on their verdict, when you oppose Mr. Hobbs with Tully? but the Doctor gives his reason. And though he had the lock in his *adducis malleum* to follow the first part of the saying *loquendum cum vulgo*, yet now it is *sentiendum cum sapientibus*. For *tanquam* without *si* signifies but *as*, not *as if*. It is pity the Doctor could not argue in *Symbols* too, that so we might not understand him, but suppose all his papers to carry evidence with them, because they are *Mathematically* scratched. How does he construe this,

*Placeo, tunc alio Druorum sanguine, tanquam
Feceris ipse aliquid propter quod nobilis esset.*

So *Calvus*, one much esteemed by *Cicero*, who hath inserted his Epistles into his works, saith (Toll. fam. ep. lib. 8. ep. 5.) *omnia desiderantur ab eo, tanquam nihil denegatum sit ei quo minus paratissimus esset, qui publico negotio propositus est*. But it was not possible the Doctor should know this, it not being in *Stephen*, where his examples for *tanquam si* are.

But the Doctor having pitched upon this criticism, and penned it, some body, I believe, put him in minde of the absurdity thereof: yet the generous professor presumed no body else could be more intelligent then he, who had perused *Stephen*. He would not retract any thing, but subjoyns, "that he will allow it as passable, because other modern writers, and some of the antients, have so used it, as Mr. Hobbs hath done. I know not what Authors the Doctor meant, for, if I am not mistaken, I do not finde any in *Stephen*. His citation of *Columella* is not right l. 5. c. 5. (nor can I deduce any thing thence till I have read the passage.) but if he take *Juvenal* and *Caesim* for modern Authors, I hope he will admit of *Accius*, *Naevius*, and *Caementa* for the only antients. Let him think upon this Criticism, and never hope pardon for his *adducis malleum*, which is not half so well justified, and yet none but mad-men or fools

fully reject it. I have here exhibited the letter without any variation, no not of that place out of *Columella*, which the Doctor might well presume I had looked into, and found to be misprinted (as many else are, and are observed by *Franciscus Florinus*) though either the transcriber or printer did me that wrong to alter the figures: for which I am no more responsible, then for that verse out of *Dionys: melinysus*, which is v. 725. and not v. 27. as it is printed: if the Doctor had consulted the place, he would not have spared me, *there*, as he doth not in his ensuing discourse.

Dr. Wallis. That of *tanquam*, is but a meer caviil, as well as the rest. *Tanquam alitercerimus*, and *tanquam possent*, I said were *Elliptical*. And are they not? That *tanquam* signifies only *as*, and not *as if*; and doth it signify any more? That *Tully's* word is *tanquam si* (which is proper enough *ad hominem*, to you that will needs be *Ciceronians*, forsooth!) And it is not so? (That is, and is it not so?) [yes and *Ovid's* too. Met. 7. *tanquam si parva dedisset Dona*,] hath not your journey-man made search in *Rob. Stephani's Thes. ling. lat. Thes. Ciceronianus* (or *Nizolius*) and cannot find any one example of *Tully* to the contrary? But he saith, *tanquam si* is not *Tully's* word, 'tis two words; (a pretty exception, let it then be *Tully's* phrase) but why not. if need be, one word, as *et-si*, *ac-si*, *etiam-si*, &c. If *et iam-si*, why not as *well tam quam si*, one word? Or *quam-ab-rem*? But I said further, that though *elliptical*, yet I would allow Mr. *Hobs* so to speak without blame; because some modern writers, and some of the ancients, do so speak. Well; was this the fault? Yes that's the fault. He would have had me condemn it absolutely, that he might have had some what so caviil at.

I shall omit what follows, this being all that is material: yet all that the peevish Doctor saith, shall be answered in its proper place. The intelligent reader will easily perceive who plays the *Caviller*: for if this be not a caviil, I do not know what it is; to condemn a thing as absolutely bad. *TANQUAM* without *si* signifies but *as*, not *as if*. And yet to allow it now so far as to confess it to be in *Celins*, *Juvenal* and other authors? Ought not that plea to be sufficient with you, which is all you alledge for *adducis malleum*? Custom and popular use being the rule of elegance, it should have sufficed you, that so much favoured Mr. *Hobs*: we would have added that the vulgar know little what belongeth to *Ellipsis*, they are not governed by *Grammar*. It is considerable how the Doctor varies his phrase, he said before *tanquam* without *si*, signified *as*, and not *as if*; now he saith, that it was an *Elliptical* expression. The difference is this, an *Elliptical* expression may be good (such are all ablatives of cause, instrument, or manner, as *Vossius* proves, and others,) but the use of a word for what it signifies not, cannot be. Of the signification of words use must be the judge. All that I say of *Stephen*, is that I did not remember any example in him: the Doctor findeth three, at least three examples; which if he knew before, every body can judge, what a petulant caviil it was for him to engage in, and how much he hath amended this matter. *Stephen's* having examples was but accidental, and if the Doctor do prove he have, he overthrows his cause, and only puts me in minde of what I professed I did not remember. If I said it was not possible for the Dr. to know more then *Rob. Stephen* would tell him; I had not only for the ground of my assertion, his being taken in *avropos*; but I also knew that being asked by a Gentleman (a familiar acquaintance of his) not much younger then my self, (if so young) how he might attain to the knowledge of the accuracies of the *Latin* tongue, he put him over to the reading of *Rob. Stephen*. the same Gentleman told me that he wondered how he pretended to the world so much *Philology*, since in a long time of converse with him, he could not perceive any excellency of his that way. He tells me he findes my quotations in *Charles Stephens Thesaurus Ciceronianus*: might not I as well tell him the texts be cireth in his *Latin* or *English* sermons, are to be found

found in several concordances? Are not all the texts there? Is it not as easie to track in the one, as in the other? Are not both of the same nature? That he went no further then *Charles Stephen*, any body that sees what he saith of *adversum cum ferro*, will grant: But what grounds he had to think I ever consulted him, I do not know.

The discourse about *tantum si* might have been omitted; for it proceeded from a mistake of mine at first; I having observed how critical the Doctor was about words, resolved to give him the like hints as my occasions would permit in so hastily an attempt; and thorough haste I charged him with calling *tantum si* Tullyes word, (which now he doth, and *Ovid* too) whereas he named it his phrase. The Doctor chargeth me not with any forgery, but goes about to defend *tantum si* for one word, whereas they are two. You may easily see how resolute the Doctor is never to acknowledge, and what is to be hoped from his good nature, who doth thus efface the most known truth. "Why not? Saith he, if need be, may not they be one word, as well as *et si*, *ac si*, or *quam*?" "ab-rem? I tell you Doctor you are not to trie customers by reason: you should for once Doctor have imitated Tully, who is reported *asum loquendi populo concessisse, scientiam sibi retinuisse*. Be pleased to hear with me *Aldus Manutius de Orthograph*. *Præfero, præfero, præfero unicum diffinitione scribo, quoniam ex tribus componitur: usu enim in unum transit; sicuti quemadmodum, quomobrem, &c. quia cum sint composita, usu tamen in unam naturam coherunt*. I expected to have heard from the *Paracritic* (it is his own word) *veteres codices, marmora, & Pandectæ Florentinæ ita scribunt*, but he puts us off with a why not? If ye do not hold his peace, he will never catch any mice: this is a piece of a proverb Doctor, *tantum si*, and *tantum si* besides are not one and the same.

Another thing observable is, that he having made use of *Tully*s authority, sayes it is *argumentum ad hominem*; "it is proper enough *ad hominem*, to you that will needs be *Ciceronian*, forsooth." But he made the objection against Mr. *Hobs*, and he is not of the number of those who will needs be *Ciceronian*. I am willing to understand the Doctor so that he spoke it by way of *Prophecy*, foreknowing that, I should write against him: yet he will not think the antients prophesied of the boye's play, *Empusa*.

§ 5.

I Am at last arrived at the main controversie, *Adducis malleum*! here is a tolerable case so maintained, that it is spoiled. A heavy work (this is the Doctors clinch) about *adducis malleum*! And the Doctor in the management of it so deporteth himself, as *Smectymnus* once did in a quarrel about the learned men the *Arcopagi*, the defence whereof found work not only for the Gentlemen of the Assembly, but that excellent pen of Mr. *Milnes*! The Grammar quarrel was carried on with as much animosity, as if the rise or downfall of *Dagon*-presbytery depended upon that *Solicisme*: nay, some have said that the *Cavaliers* are justly expelled *Oxon*, for being so absurd as to think that those divines (of which our Doctor was a *Scribe*) which could make rules of faith, could break those of Grammar. The Doctor being descended from these infallible Grammatis, it is not to be wondered that he will not acknowledge, but defend himself (and which is more) as *th-y did*. Although I need no more then to transcribe or remit the reader to the letter for his satisfaction, wherein all the question is so stated that any person of intellectuals beyond Doctor *Wallis* may receive a true account of the case, and of the rule of elegance (without a rule, there is no transgression! He that reads a book so as to pick and choose, cull and reject, makes not his Author the rule of elegance, but himself, and follows not the *uber* but his own phanfy, and of the validity of Mr. *Hob*'s exception:

exception: yet because I perceive our Mathematician not to be so perspicacious as others are, I must crave leave to accommodate my self to his capacity, the letter being not intended for satisfying him, but one of more ingenuitie. The preliminaries are all couched in the letter, which yet I shall now more largely set down, and then subjoyn the text itself.

It is to be noted that I make *Tully* the sole rule of Latin elegance, and other Authors no further useful (as to language) then they speak conformably to him. *Unus Cicero omnium elegantissimè est locutus: purè quidem alii quod est in maximà laudis parte ponendum; pressè alii, ac prope unà in brevitate divini existerunt. Sed unus Cicero laudem omnium ac virtutes in se transtulit omnes, purè hic in loco, nec multis cum res postulat, agit; in uno autem illo illustranda orationis genere DEUS est, verborum delectum eloquentia originem Caesar esse dicebat: atqui alii SEMPER aliquid habent, quod aut profus damnetur, aut saltem aquè non probetur, vetustatem alii nimis dedit à operà consecrantur, in agrestibus ac parùm cultis sese alii magis oblectant, alii alio vitio laborant, UNUS Cicero tantùm abest ut tale quicquam in se admiseret, ut messem illam nobis, atque verborum omnium copiam omnem perpurgàrit, qui NIHIL in sermonem, quod non Romanum oleret, quod ab ætatis suæ culm atque dignitate quicquam abhorreret, quod omni denique splendore non elucesceret, profus interextinguit.*

I shall not engage at present in a defence of the imitation of *Tully*: that the Latin tongue is to be gained by imitation and converse with Authors, is confessed: that not the imitation of any single author, nor the framing of a new stile out of the reading of many, or all, promiscuously, is to be preferred before the bare imitation of *Cicero* (*quod non tam hominis quam eloquentia nomen est!*) This hath been asserted with sufficient advantage to the cause by *Cortesium* against *Politian*, *Bembus* against *Picus Mirandula*; *Riccins*, *Doletus*, &c. against *Erasmus*, whose dialogue entitled *Ciceronianus* did so disgust the learned of that age, that he was more declaimed against for that insolent and malicious piece, then any other work of his; he found that it was more facile to decry the *Papacy*, then *Tully*; he found his reputation as to all manner of learning so lost thorough the publishing of that Pamphlet, that there was no possibility to regain his esteem but by a recantation, which he did, professing himself *redisse in gratiam cum Cicerone*.

Now for what is conformable to *Tully's* stile, I do not leave to the Umpirage of *LILLIES* Grammar, nor yet to the determination of *Nicolas* or *Charles Stephen's* Ciceronian dictionaries, nor *Doletus's* commentaries, or *Schorius*, or *Riccins*, nor any other of that kinde. He that would be a competent judge of elegance, must be thorough-paced in

Tally; and have weighed attentively his words, phrases, periods, the *numerosity* of the one, the choice and use of the other: In order to the latter, I expect either that the same phrase be produced, or some other of the same nature and kinde, which may be equivalent. But the Doctor must pardon me, that School (whither he removed the case :) very wisely! For he knew nothing of the customes there, for that is the true construction of these his words, *what belongs to the discipline of Westminster School I do not so well know, as perhaps this Epistoler*) and in his *Protopopæia* hath been as happy as the Scotch painter, who being requested to paint London, drew *Edenborough*; which did not tend to the disgrace of the city, but painter :) that School never permitted me to argue *a genere ad genus*, from the Metaphorical use of the word, to the proper use of the same. Nor to conclude from the use of the Simple verb, the use of the compound: nor from the use of one or more compounds in a certain sense, to the using of another in the same manner. It being a way of reasoning from possibilities to realities, from the imaginary use of the word at some time, to the real use of it in the best and purest times: in which manner of arguings though the *divines* of late have much pleased themselves, and especially the Doctor in his *thesis*; yet I cannot approve it in them, or allow it in him. These things being premised, (which any body might have observed in the extract, which was sent to a person of understanding; however it came into Doctor Wallis's hands!) It is evident that whatever the Doctor hath produced of *Adducere febrem, sitim, fastidium, rem in iudicium, discrimen, periculum: controversiam, dubium, angustiam, locum, statum, ordinem, ad manus, ad concordiam; vitam in extremum.* (Which are all or most of what he hath alledged in *adduco*.) are impertinent: the question being concerning *local transportation*. Again, it is clear, that whatever he hath alledged out of *deduco, roduco, educo, perduco, produco, traduco, abduco, ebduco, duco*, amount not to a full proofe of the case in hand, were they as significant as the Doctor would have the credulous reader to believe him *in verbo sacerdotis*!

Another thing the Doctor should have considered, that I having fixed my rule of elegance otherwise, I am not to be refuted out of Pliny, Varro, Columella, &c. If I alledge any author of that stamp, it is a valid argument *ad hominem*, where Doctor Wallis is concerned; because he makes use of them as the rule of speech: but against me the procedure is as foolish, as if I should measure by the yard, and the Doctor mete with an Ell. The difference is about principles, not inferences, and therefore the Doctor should either have disputed what I took for a principle, and he

he did not; or else not have intermeddled. But the Doctor is a professor of *Mathematicks*, and not *Logick*; I would fain know whether this be any part of *Logistica Speciosa*? Or the new *Analysis*? If I were to write of *Physick*, *Husbandry*, &c. I should not doubt to supply *Tully's* defect of terms out of those kinde of Authors, yet I should not make use of their expressions further then they are *vocabula artis*. If the Doctor had considered his quotations, he must either fall into a gross paralogisme *ex particularibus*, or tell us that whatsoever the drag-net of Authors (antient and antick, Poets and prosaick writers) hath drawn down, and tendered to us in gross, *prawn*, *Crabfish* and *Lobster*, *Sea-weed*, *shells*, *shrubs*, unpicked, ungarded, this is the *RULE* of Elegance. Otherwise his reason is no more then this, *There are some expressions in Varro, Columella, Pliny, &c. which are passably elegant: Therefore this of mine is such*. Though it be not in terminis, nor by any thing equivalent, to be found there, for ought either he, or I know.

What esteem is to be attributed to *Terence*, *Scaliger* telleth concerneth *facere contumeliam: decere vobis*: in his defence of *Tully*: and as for *Plautus* who fitteth his Latin to his persons, I shall never account his *virniliter dicta* (*eduxi merum, abduxi clavem*) for elegancies when any body hereafter shall use them, but *Dr. Wallis*. His argument from them, must be *ex particularibus*. I desire my allegations out of *Scaliger* and *Doletus* above-mentioned may be considered in this place.

As for the Poets, if he mean they shall stand for any thing, he must argue out of them, as he did out of the others, or else every man will be apt to throw dirt in his face; for, can any man defend all that ever *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Ovid*, &c. have said, I will not say to be good in prose (though that allone is to the question,) but in modern verse something in order to this hath been said afore out of *Stephen*, and it is infinite that might be objected against the three. I profess I am not disposed to converse in *Meter*; yet I shall then do it, when our judicious professor, shall versifie in *Tully's* prose; or that he may better it, in *Tully's* poetry. *Ovid* is said to be such a master of elegancies, that he hath been characterized as one in *quo nullus est verborum delectus, nulla ad solam orationem accomodata locutio*. I shall not disparage *Virgil*, nor *Horace* (whose *non bene pro multa libertas venditur auro*, may vie with *cum imperi percurrere*, I think) they are all *Candendi non loquendi exempla*. As for his urging passages out of *Mr. Hobs* against him it is as vain, as if he had urged them against me. *Mr. Hobs* intended to inform our judgements, not to write what either should be an example or rule of elegance: he desired to be understood, to be read for improvement of knowledge, not

the advancement of the *Latin Language*: I believe the Doctor doth think better of his own *English*, then Mr. *Hobs* of his *Latin*; yet I hope neither he, nor any else, will write thereby. The Doctor therefore did herein, (as in other things) mistake himself; when he used that for his defence of elegance, which the other never intended for such; yet Mr. *Hobs* might justly, (upon contest) except against the Doctors *fisculi*, though he had used them himselfe, because he did not pretend to, nor aver them to be embellishments of speech, however significant enough.

Having entertained you with these preliminaries, I see no reason yet why I should transcribe all that the Doctor hath said in his *due correction* p. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. I desire to give my thoughts as little diversion as may be, from other studies: and yet I would not omit any thing unanswered that this *χαλκίπτερος* *Pygmy* hath objected. I shall therefore next subjoyn the letter, and then survey his scattered exceptions, as they fall in: And (which is more) show in the close that I can allow of the Doctors conclusion, however he hath wrangled about the premises.

Now follows his ridiculous Apology for *adducis malleum, ut occidas muscam*, the occasion why he made use of that proverb (of his own phrasing) was this. Mr. *Hobs* had taken a great deal of pains to demonstrate what Doctor *Wallis* thought he could have proved in short: upon this occasion he objects, *adducis malleum, ut occidas muscam*, which I shall suppose he intended to English thus, *you bring a beetle to kill a fly*. Mr. *Hobs* retorted, that *adduco* was not used in that sense. The Doctor vindicates himself thus, *duco, deduco, reduco, perduco, produco*, &c. signifie strange things, *ergo*, *adduco* may be used in that sense: which is a most ridiculous kinde of arguing, where we are but to take up our language from others, and not to coyn new phrases. It is not the *Grammar* that shall secure the Doctor, nor *weak Analogies*, where elegance comes in contest. To justify his expression he must have shewed it *usu tritum*, or alleged the Authority of some Author of great note for it. I have not the leisure to examine his impertinent citations about those other compounds, nor yet of the simple verb *duco*; nay, to justify his saying he hath not brought one parallel example. He talks indeed very high, that *duco* (with its compounds) is a word of a large signification, and amongst the rest to bring, fetch, carry, &c. is so exceeding frequent in all Authors (*Plautus, Terence, Tully, Caesar, Tacitus, Pliny, Seneca, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Claudian*, &c. that he must needs be either maliciously blinde, or a very stranger to the Latin tongue that doth not know it, or can have the face to deny it. I read what will be my doom for not allowing his Latin; yet I must profess I dare secure the Doctor for having read all Authors, notwithstanding his assertions, and I hope he will do the like for me. And for those which he hath read, had he brought no better proofes then these, he had, I am sure, been whipped soundly in *Westminster School* for his impudence, as well as ignorance by the learned master thereof at present. But I dare further affirm, that the Doctor hath not read in this point any, but only consulted with *Robert Stephens thesaurus linguae Latinae*, whence he hath borrowed his allegations in *adduco*; and for the other I had not so much idle time, as to compare them. And lest the fact might be discovered he hath sophisticated those Authors whence *Stephens* cites the expressions, and imposed upon them others. If it be not so, or that the Doctor could not write it right when the copy was right before him; let him tell me where he did ever read in *Plautus, adducta res in fessidum*. I finde the whole sentence in *Pliny's* preface to *Vespasian* (out of whom

'in the precedent paragraph he cites it) about the middle; *alia verò id multis prodios;*
'*ut in fastidium sint adducta*, which is the very example *Stephanus* useth, although he
'doth premise his *adducta res in fastidium*. Let the Doctor tell where he ever did read
'in *Horace Ova nobilia* &c. *adducunt radium vini*. Did he (or any else, with the inter-
'position of an, &c.) make *Trochicks*? I say, and *Stephanus* sayes so too, that is in
'*Pliny* lib. 13. c. 15. near the end; the whole sentence runs thus, *Ebristi Ova nobilia*
'*per triduum data in vino, radium ejus adducunt*. I doubt not but these are the places
'he aimed at, although he disguised and minced the Quotations: if they be not, I
'should be glad to augment my *Stephanus* with his additions.

These things premised, I come to consider the Doctors proofes: *Res è adducta est:*
'*adducta vita in extremum: adductares in fastidium: rem ad mucrones et manus adducere:*
'*contracta res et adducta in angustum: res ad concordiam adduci potest: in ordinem adducere:*
'*adducere febres, frim, radium vini:* (all in *Robert Stephen*) betwixt which and *addu-*
'*cere malleum*. what a vast difference there is, I leave them to umpier *qui teretes et reli-*
'*giosus nati sunt aures*, who are the competent judges of elegancy, and only cast in
'the verdict of one or two, who are in any place (where the purity of the Latin
'tongue flourisheth) of great esteem. *Loofaus* in his *Scopa lingua Latina, ad purgandum*
'*linguam à barbarie*, &c. (would any think that the Doctors elegant expression, fre-
'quent in all Authors, which none but the malicious or ignorant can deny, should suf-
'fer so contumelious an expurgation?) *Loofaus* (I say) hath these words: *Adferre*
'*plerique minus attenti utuntur pro adducere. Quod Plautus, in Pseudolo, insigni exemplo*
'*notat. C. Atuli hunc. P. Quid atulisti? C. Adduxi volui dicere. P. Quis istic est? C.*
'*Cbarinus. Satis igitur admonet discriminis inter ducere, reducere, adducere, et abducere,*
'*qua de personâ; et ferre, adferre, &c. quæ de re dicuntur. Idem. Domitium, quem o-*
'*go novi, adduce; argentum non moror quin ferres. Cavendum igitur est ne vulgi more,*
'(let the Doctor mark this, and know that this author is authentick amongst the *Cica-*
'*ronians*) *adferre de personâ dicamus, sed adducere; licet et hoc de certis quibusdam rebus*
'*non ineptè dicatur*. In this last clause he saith as much as *Mr. Hobs* saith, and what
'the Doctor proves: but that ever the Doctor brought any example which might re-
'semble *adducis malleum*, is denied: for I have mentioned already his allegations eve-
'ry one of *adduco*. Another Author (a fit Antagonist for the elegant Doctor) is the
'*sarrago* *sordidorum verborum*, joyned with the Epitome of *L. Valla's* elegancies. He
'saith, *Accersere, adduc Petrum, latine dicitur pro eo quod pueri dicunt, adfer Petrum*. And
'this may suffice to justifie *Mr. Hobs's* exception, who proceeded no further then this
'Author, to tell the Doctor that *adduco* was used of animals. But the Doctor replies,
'*this signification is true, but so may the other be also*. I answer, if it never have been u-
'sed so, it cannot be so, for we cannot coyn new Latin words, no more then French,
'or Spanish, that are foreigners. A man may lawfully adde some words to a language
'that is in vogue, because use may in time naturalize them: but we must leave a dead
'language such as we finde it in the monuments of antiquity, and it is sacriledge to med-
'dle with it. *Mr. Hobs* was upon the Negative, and not to disprove the contrary opi-
'nion. If the Doctor would be believed, he must prove it by some example (which
'is all the proofe of elegancy) and till he do so, not to believe him, it is sufficient
'not to have cause. But Doctor *Wallis*, why not *adduco* for a hammer, as well as a tree?
'I answer yes, equally for either, and yet for neither: did ever any body go about to
'mock his Readers thus solemnly? I do not finde (to my best remembrance) any exam-
'ple of it in *Stephen*, and the Doctor is not wiser then his book; if there be, it is
'strange the Doctor should omit the only pertinent example, and trouble us with such
'impertinencies for three or four pages. In *Stephen* there are *adducere habenas*, and
'*adducere lorum*, but in a different sense. It is not impossible I may guess at the Do-

ctors.

* *Actis tunc: In Tully de nat. deor.* (as I remember) there is this passage: *Quum autem ille respondisset, in agro ambulanti ramulum adductum, ut remissus esset, in orbem suum revolvendo, where it signifies nothing else but to be bent, bowed, or pulled back, and in that sense the hammer of a clock, or that of a smith when he fetcheth his stroke, may be said adducti.* And this I conceive the Doctor would have us in the close think to have been his meaning; else what doth he drive at in these words? When you have done the best you can, you will not be able to finde better words then *adducere malleum* and *reducere*, to signifie the two contrary motions of the hammer, the one when you strike with it, (*excellently trivial!*) the other when you take it back (*better and better!*) What to do? *To fetch another stroke.* If any can believe that this was his meaning, I shall justifie his Latin, but must leave it to him to prove it sense. If he intended no more, why did he go about to defend the other meaning; and never meddle with this? Which yet might have been proved by this one example of mine? May not therefore his own saying be justly retorted upon him in this case; *Adducti malleum, attecidas musican?*

The Doctor deals very intricately in his reply, and seems therefore to have been more confused, that so he might make the better flourish, and that might pass for a sufficient answer, which was not in the least manner applicable to the case in hand. Once for all I shall acquaint the reader with a piece of the Doctors Rhetorick, wherein he doth much please himself: It is a bad imitation of what was excellently used by *Hortensius*, whose custome it was *Accusationis membra dividere, et in digitis suis singulas partes causa constituere; et deinde unumquodque transfigere, expellere, absolvere.* In imitation of him the Doctor seems not to have weighed the whole context of what I had said, but (*divine like*) takes all the frame into pieces, and then examines each parcel and fragment, as if it were a sentence *integræ, absolute*, independent of what precedes or follows. As for example, the *Pantomime* thus flourisheth it. "Enter Mr. *Hobbs*'s second, what sayes he? He sayes it is *ridiculous*. That is easie said: but saying so doth not make it so. This is his reflexion upon that passage of mine: Now follows his ridiculous Apology for *adducti malleum*. It is true I wrote an Epistle, not a *tractate*, to a person of *ingenuity*, not to the Doctor, and therefore I did rather *hint* then *urge* the proofes of my assertion: But any body now may see the vanity of his exception, that shall but read these *preliminaries* which I have here inserted, not as a *new addition*, but by way of *explanation* of what was evidently contained in the text before. I did as little dream the Doctor should have ever been a judge of that letter, as he *professe* by his *argumentum ad hominem*, that some *Ciceronian* should attacke him: If I had thought so I should have accommodated myself to him. If the Doctor when he unlocked the Kings cabinet of letters, did use him as he hath abused me, both in gloss and text, it is very possible that he may have done that cause to which I was still a friend, *good service*, but I cannot commend the means.

Such another reflexion is that of his p. 21. "To say there is a vast difference, and not to tell us where that difference lies, are but empty words. This is his animadversion upon that saying of mine, "these things premised (*which are now explained in the preliminaries*) I come to consider the Doctors proofes. *Res est adducta est: adducta vitæ in extremum, &c.* betwixt which and *adducere malleum*, what a vast difference there is, I leave then to umpier *qui teretes et religiosas nati sunt aures*, who are the competent judges of elegance. I suppose by this time the difference is clear, and the *paralogisme* from the use of the *figurative* signification to the proper one evinced: which they to whose arbitrement I referred my self could not miss of: though our *little man* (but *great Critick*) could not perceive it. I did not mean by *teretes aures*, a round-head, (which name I take to suit with those that engaged in an holy war, for my

part
any
vers
it
did
att
belie
Exam
this op
I m
to the
Dr.
"wor
"that
"will
"duo
"his
"a go
To
posi
here g
se him
ganic
did m
anibor
determ
vogue
such ar
clude i
(whol
neither
"sily fa
"ing w
"ganc
ground
differ
were f
how ar
deftan
Dr.
"19.
"a fa
"I dis
"prin
"Rob
"der
"thofe
"more
"phen
"if I h
"with

part I adhered to the Parliament and the liberty of the subject nor did I ever intend that any should construe *Aurei religiosi* for *Presbyterians*. This kind of elocution discovers it self in all the Doctors controversial writings; but yet with a different success then did attend *Hortensius*, who where he could not *deceive*, he did *delight*: our Doctor I believe hath been as far from *pleasing* as he hath been from *imposing* upon them. In his *Examen of Loissius and Crocius*, in his discourse of *vs*, and else where he doth lie at this open ward: but that I shall consider in its peculiar place.

I must now invert the order of what the Doctor hath delivered, and so apply them to the parts of the letter: his first exception is,

Dr. W. repl. He observes further that in some of the allegations we have not the word *adduco*, but the simple verb *duco*, or some other compound: And therefore that all these are *impertinent*: because (forsooth) it is not *Grammar*, or *Analogy* that will secure us. But we are still besides the business. The original charge is against *duco*; and against *adduco* but as one of the train, not as a stragler from the rest of his company. And therefore the allegations are all pertinent: and that Analogy is a good argument in the case, we shall hear from his own witness by and by.

To this there needs no further reply, then that the reader consider my *preliminary positions*: only that the Doctor may learn hereafter to read with more attention I shall here give him so much light out of the text of the letter as may be requisite for to *rehearse* him, though it may be *impertinent* as to others. The question is concerning *elegance*; proof of *elegance* is to be deduced from the *use* in such ages as Latin eloquence did most flourish in: since that age cannot be recalled, our recourse must be to such authors as wrote then: many of those are *lost*, others *corrupted*, if therefore we would determine anything of *Elegance* we must apply our selves to those whom the general vogue of all ages hath represented unto us as the most pure and eloquent writers; and such are only *Cicero* and *Tully*: whose expressions we may *acquire* in and safely conclude it good, because found in their works. If we finde ought in any other author, (whose authority is suspected) we can only say *possibly* it may have been used, but neither their using it, nor any conformity with Grammar can secure us, so that I did justly say that where we are but to take up our language from others, the Doctors arguing was ridiculous: neither could Grammar, or Analogies secure him, where elegance comes in contest. That the original charge lies against *Duco* is false; for the ground of contest was *adduco*: and that the case of the simple & compound verb may be different, is a *preliminary hypothesis*: so that his allegations are not pertinent, if they were *significative*: my witnesses say not that Analogy in any case is a good argument: and how any argument can be good in one case and not in another (*ceteris paribus*) I understand not.

His second exception runs thus.

Dr. W. He takes notice (for so he was told in the Catalogue of *Errata*) that page 19. l. 23. *Horace* is put for *Pliny*, (that you may see how quick sighted he is, to spy a fault when it is shewed him) and that line 7. there is *Plau.* for *Plin.* (which had I discovered it in time, had been put amongst the *Errata* with the rest) which was the printer's mistake. &c. Then he observes, that these allegations are to be found in *Robert Stephen's Thesaurus linguae Latinae*: that is, some of them, (or else 'twere a wonder) but I hope he will not undertake for all. If he finde those of page 20. 21. (and those are a competent number) in *Robert Stephen*, he hath good luck. And 'tis more then I know if all the rest be there. But he supposeth that I consulted with *Stephen*. It is very like so, if I had had him at hand, (he'd have thought me a fool if I had not) and did not he consult with him also for *cum*, and *tantum*, (yes and with *Charles Stephen* too) and with *Henry Stephen* for *symp*? Nay, he dares affirm,

he c

" he says, that I have not read in this point any, but only consulted with him. He's a valiant man, you see. He dares affirm, what I durst not, who have best reason to know. Perhaps he means, I did not read over all those Authors to make that collection. (No truly: I would not have him think I was such a fool.) Or that for what places I found in Stephen, I did not consult the original authors. (For some, I did; for some I did not: for I did not think it worth the while, the controversy did not deserve it. Much less to examine all the Criticks and Commentators upon them, as it seems Mr. Hobs would have had me) but what is all this to the purpose? I never took Robert Stephen to be a weeder of the Latin tongue, as if all that he had gathered were but to be thrown away; or that a phrase were ever the worse for being found in him. We have so much of the flourish, that I am afraid we shall have little substance.

I answer, that in the Catalogue of Errata Plin. is substituted for Hor. But that I was any more told that, then that Plau. was put for Plin. I hope the reader will believe me: I neither read his thoughts, nor his table of Errata: I thought he could not commit any, who will not allow any in another: it was but a lesson of his own teaching, that I did then read him: it will require some grains of allowance, for him to verifie that ever I was shewed that catalogue: and if it were not shewed me, I am as quick-sighted as another, notwithstanding that I might have seen it, if I had looked in the latter end. But henceforth I shall look for Synod-man's Errata, and if I do not finde all at the end of their books, I will imagine they have some mental reserves, which they did intend to put in, but that they did not discover them timely enough. But have not I as good reason, to judge of him, as he of Mr. Hobs, that the printer did print it so, why? Because the Author had written it so. Thus much for that, where I must take his word, for his thoughts; as he must mine, for not having seen his Errata. As for his having plundered Stephen, I never saw such a justification in my life, as our Amb. sister Hortensius makes. I said he had borrowed his quotations in adduco, out of Robert Stephen: and for the rest, I had not time to compare them. He makes me to speak as if they were only found there: whereas now he transcribe them, he hopes I will not undertake for all: I never said I would; I told you I had compared only adduco: he saith I have good luck, if I finde those of pag. 20. 21. (and those are a competent number) in Robert Stephen. I am of the witty-pol's minde: for the quotations of those pages, are all out of Mr. Hobs himself, and I may then hope to finde them in Stephen, when he findes the universal Church and it's Catholick ministers (distinct from those called by the people) in Scripture. He saith, that I suppose he consulted with Stephen: It is no groundless supposal, both as to the quotations in this first, and second pamphlet: I SAW HIM: The sentence following is somewhat dubious, by reason of a parenthesis f-yied in wrong: I think he says, "It is very likely so (that he had consulted with him) if he had had him at hand. It is very probable the Doctor hath not one of his own, and that made him repair to the publick library to transcribe him. But doth not this carry an import as if he had never looked in him? It is a pretty piece of equivocation! I profess I had never looked there, had he not reminded me thereof, and so I resolved to see the bottom of his learning, which now I see depends not upon converse with good books, but with dictionaries, ordinary dictionaries and Grammars, as his divinity riseth no higher then the Synod's Catechisme. As for what follows, I never intended to put him to research into the several authors on purpose for this controversy, but I hoped he would not alledge that place, of the import and sense, whereof he was not ascertained by autopsy. Some places he did examine, some he did not. It is an easie thing for to reply, that he had done well not to have alledged such places as he could not be certain they made for him, because he had not considered them in their relation to foregoing or ensuing passages. He had also done

well

well to have pitched upon those he was sure of, and for the credit of the rest have referred us to *Stephen*. But then the reputation of having read so many Authors, with such accurateness as not to understand them (which was all Mr. *Hobs* I suppose did require of him; whether he were beholden to a commentatour or his own invention for the intelligence, it mattered not) this had been *Cost*, and we had not known what a *Brave* in Criticks two universities and the assembly of divines had produced. But he further excepts, that my exception is not to the purpose. If he mean that it doth not prejudice the allegations, I grant it: but my purpose then was to expose the *Paracritick*, and I believe he will not doubt that what I said did conduce to this purpose. "He never took *Stephen* for a weeder of the Latin tongue. No indeed, nor I neither; he gives a good account of words and phrases poetical, oratorical, historical, &c. so that the book is a good book, and of good use, when the reader doth not so far mistake as to seek for the defence of oratory amongst his *Poeticks*: so that I allow *Stephen*, as I would approve of the *Physick* garden, wherein there are *simples* applicable to several uses; but I look upon the Doctor as a *Quack salver* or *Mounte bank* in his defence.

And now I leave any body to compare what of *flourish* hath been produced, I come now to examine his little substance.

I shall herein desire that my preliminary positions be not forgotten: And that it may be remembered how in the conduct of the letter, I had two things in hand, one thing to consider the controversy as stated betwixt the two combatants, Mr. *Hobs* and Dr. *Wallis*: and another to consider it in it self, and according to the truth. You heard my judgement in the preliminaries; to excuse Mr. *Hobs* I cited *Loofaw* and *Crocius*, (I might have cited others, but that I thought them the most fit counterpose to the Doctor) who say as much as he: and if that they be *impertinent*, you see Mr. *Hobs* hath company: though for my part I doubt not but that they intended to restrain *adduco* to persons, and *affero* to things: Neither would they have been put off by the opposition he makes: no more then *Laurentius Valla*, whose elegancies have still a great esteem, though *Mancinellus* hath endeavoured to disgrace them by better quotations then our Doctor brings: against all which it is a sufficient defence, that *Valla* did make only *Quintilian* (for he he made *Tully* truckle under him) for his rule, and by that rule he did condemn those barbarisms, which others had made use of. But I shall tell you more! Amongst those Authors that say *duco* is used of animals, and *affero* of inanimates, there is one *Hemy Stephen* (my name-sake) in his *Thef. Gr. L.* having observed how *duco* was used of inanimates *ayw dōeg*, &c. concludes, at *LATINI dona aut vestes aut aurum Adducere NON dicent, sed adferre, aut advehere*. But he is a School-Author, and there I read him all over, but *Loofaw* at the

He saith they both are two School-books: It may be so, but I do not know what Schools in England use them. That they are in request in the *Jesuits-Schools*, that *Jacobus Pontanus* and others have commended them, I know: But is it an exception against *Loofaw* and *Crocius*, that they are School-books? And shall it not be against *Lilly*? Are *Stephen*, *Calpine*, *Thomassius*, *Rider*, *Janus Nomenclator*, the less School-books, because they are in a bigger volume? Or are not those books that are taught in Schools, the best? I thought so; but it may be the Doctor hath been educated otherwise. He charges me over and over again for reading *Animals* instead of *bodies animate*: and then substituting as equivalent to both, that of *persons*. To the first I answer, that if it be a *slip*, it was occasioned through haste: and not voluntary, with an intention of stating the question otherwise: Again, the discourse being concerning language, which hath had alwayes it's rise from vulgar conceptions, I am not to be blamed for using their thoughts, who were to justify me in the use of the word: Now I doubt not but that the most of men understand *Animals* and *bodies animate* as Synonyma: and what they are in my philosophy, I shall tell

him when he tells us his opinion of *rarefaction*, or of those in whose power it shall be to call those *vice-pastores*, *vice-domini*, vicars of Christ which he speaks of in his thesis. As for my substituting of *persons* instead of both, I think I do not do it, but do truly cite *Loofaus*. I suppose that the dispute is not to be ended in *Metaphysics*; I take *persons* in this vulgar sense, *id est persona, quantum ad ipsam actionem, quod in se habet quod possit agere, vel non agere*. And so there will not be any great difference: whether you call them *bodies animate*, *animals*, or *persons*. In the place, *Loofaus* doth not say, that *Analogy* is a good argument, which the Doctor said he did. His example is of *adduce*, and what he infers, *satis igitur admodum discriminis interducere, Reducere, adducere, abducere, qua de persona; et Ferre, Adferre, &c. qua de re dicuntur*. Are as full proofs as was required for Mr. *Hobs*, and as much as needed to be inferred: and I was not to maintain my own opinion there, as is expressly said in the Letter: which if it did not reach the controversy as now stated, yet it was full proofs as to what was intended. And for my judgement it stands irrefragably ballanced upon those preliminary suppositions. But the Doctor saith how he doth argue by way of *Analogy* from one particular compound (which is *adduco*) to the rest: but he doth not say, that the arguing is good, as my preliminaries evince it not to be: and therefore the Doctor was out, in arguing from the fall to the *equitableness* or *validity* of the thing. I am not to defend him, I did not alledge him to that purpose: and the Doctors *Hortensian* discourse about *adferri*, is nothing to the matter, but that he would be silent. I say my observation reaches no further then that *adduco* is used of *persons*, or of *things* considered as *persons*; and *affero* of *things*, and even of *persons* if they be not considered as such: thus *hæc illi ferri, adferri, referri*, is sometimes good of *men*: but then, they are not considered as any way contributing to their *local transportation*. And thus may be solved all the Doctors allegations out of *Tully*, and *Loofaus* be never concerned in it; who meant I doubt not the same that I do now say: of *figurative motions* I give no rule, but regulate my self by *ipse, Loofaus, Crecius*, &c. will be no more moved at his quotations of *Virgil*, (for *horses* and such animals are considered as *persons*) then I, unless it had been to laughter. And that *Epirotema* of his, *Now would any think that Virgils elegant expression should suffer so contumelious an expurgation*, hath little of weight in it, for the question is about *elegance*, and he doth but beg the *question*, which in citing *Tully* I do not. What validity the citations of Poets have, I have already discussed, and more may be collected out of the passages of *Scaliger* and *Dolet*: and that *Broom sweeps clean*, if the other do not. And thus I have done with that tedious discourse about *Loofaus*, and have given a just account of every thing relating thereto, (as I think) yet amongst such an *ench-porch* of talk, something may have passed not as *unanswerable*, but as *unanswered*. It is false that I oblige to the Pedantry of *proving each phrase to a syllable*; how far I require the testimony of old authors, I have so far explicated as is necessary. "He saith some that *no fools take a greater latitude*, and would rather forfeit that title of *Ciceronianus ævis*, "tis *Erasmus* his Echo; who you see could jumble languages to make a clench" then be so confounded. He doth not tell us that in so doing they did wisely: and therefore notwithstanding this; other that are no fools, may have committed folly. That "*Are would as well Echo to Presbyterianus, Wallisianus, Puteanus, Salernitanus, as Ciceronianus*. And for the *justness* climb in the Echo it is more excusable, then otherwise, as the Doctor useth it: and *Janus Doufa* hath pestered us with a poem *operose nugæ*, of the same quality: it is well that all mens actions are not examples. But to proceed: that *adduco* to bring, in reference to *local physical transportation*, it is to be used of men *Idem*: but in reference to a *moral transportation* it may. That *adduco* to bend, or bow, (wherein there is not a *local transportation* of the whole) may be used of any thing capable of such a motion, I do grant. Thus *adducere ramum* may be good: *addu-*

cure cor
piece of
ite: ungi
forte fer
bends, b
l. 8, ne

Which
The case
now rea

This do
his proo
ken off
not see
I desire

This a
tation,
"hope d
understo
mina, du
The a
another:
was,

Pellucere
ses were
re, to ex
those voc
near the
dem enst
twice inc
more vali
is this: b
versary,
not keep
gue that
did expre
Latin by
tel.

But I h
the using
signifies
sonally; a

cute corium, adducere ostium, adducere nervum: all pass. And so doth the Doctors piece of Latin, *ad incudem adducendo malleum*, (*et adducendo*, is without example) *iterumque reducendo, cum labore operoso et molesto admodum, & iteratis ictibus, si muskam forte feriant, occident proculdubio*. Thus you see I can allow him *adducere ramos*, to bend, but not to bring boughes, nor yet trees: It is a pretty allegation out of Ovid, *Metam.* l. 8. near the end.

—*adductaque funibus arbor.*

Which doth not at all satisfie me as to a tree, and I wonder how he could ever hope it. The case is this: *Erisichon* had been long in hewing down an old oake, which being now ready to fall, he tyed ropes to the top of it, and so pulled it down.

*Persequitur scelus ille sumum, labefactaque tandem
lævis innumeris, adductaque funibus arbor
Corruit, et multam prostravit pondere sylvam.*

This doth not convince me for a local transportation at all: And now I have done with his proofes of *Adduco*, which are all impertinently pertinent: The other proofes are taken off by my preliminaries, and were so by the letter before, but the Doctor would not see that: yet that it may be observable how secure the Doctor is in his quotations; I desire not only that *adductaque funibus arbor*, be taken notice of; but also

Atque satis aliè vidi traducere messes. Virg. Eclog. 8.

This allegation occurs no less then twice, and then the second time it hath this annotation, "i.e. *transferre*". But these are plants only, not trees! I know not where to hope that the Doctor hath weighed his citations, if not here: yet I cannot think he understood it; for it signifies no more here then doth *Ducite ab urbe domum mea carmina, ducite Daphnim*.

The ancients did imagine corn might be conveyed by Magick out of one field into another: a case whereof we have in *Plin. l. 18. c. 6.* and in the twelve tables the Law was,

Nè pellicunt alienas segetes excantando:

Pellicere and *excantare* being the Pontifical words, (which make it clear that the *messes* were considered personally,) how can any one wonder if *Virgil* made use of *traducere*, to express the same act? Seeing he doth very frequently either *retain* or allude to those *vocabula artis*: as in *porricere exta, ossa legere*, &c. Another place out of *Tully* near the end of his oration for *Quintius*, is; *Quod ibidem rectè custodire poterunt, id ibidem custodiant: quod non poterunt, id auferre et Abducere licebit*. These words though twice inculcated by the Doctor are not *Tullies*, but the *Prætor's*, whose *edicts* are of no more validity for *Latin*, then our own *law-discourses* are for *English*. The case, again, is this: by this edict all the goods, chattels, &c. were consigned over to *Quintius* adversary, together with the rest of his estate: with this proviso, that what they could not keep safe upon the place, that they might carry away: from whence if any will argue that *adduco* is used of things, it is as gross a paralogisme, as if because the Greeks did express the depopulation and despoiling of a country by *ἀγρὸν ὑψηλόν*, and the Latins by *agere & ferre*: therefore *ἀγρὸν* was used of *ports* and *pipkins*, and *οἶκον* of *cattel*.

But I have now done with this point, there being no disagreement betwixt us as to the using of the hammer, but *fetching* it: *Adduco* when it signifies to *fetch*, or *bring* signifies it in a *Moral* sense, and so is appropriated to *persons*, or things considered personally; and therefore the Doctor was out (notwithstanding his question whether an

hammer be à *persu*? Where the sense is different,) when he used *Adductum* for to bring by a local transportation an hammer. As for the signification of *duco*, which he says Mr. Hobbs and I were ignorant of; and with a relation and prooffe whereof he troubles us for some pages: I would have him know I was not ignorant of it, but declined it as impertinent, since I did not regulate my Latin by reason, but custome: and had long since concluded with Tully, *usum loquendi populo relinquere, scientiam mihi reservare*. I knew of the promiscuous use of words, and how the significations of words were altered and changed in popular discourses, it is no wonder then if we did not miss of what we should have blushed to object. I wish him more discretion in his choice and use of Authors hereafter: and not to bring nullities.

I observe that he doth several times correct Stephen in this piece, and in this discourse; yet I noted above, that he seemed to disown him (if *I had had him*) the truth "is Robert Stephen doth often erre in his citation of Authors, and sometimes in the thing it self that is cited. And in this case I cannot think of the Doctor but I remember what Francis Floridus Sabinus relates of Doletus, that having stolen his commentaries de lingua Latina out of Robert Stephen and others, he braved it as if they had been his own collections: but in the controversie betwixt him and Baysius (or Charles Stephen) he defends his mistake in Remulus, thus: At Robertus Stephanus antea erat reprehendendus, qui in dictionario suo Romulum pro Scapha posuerat. Recte quidem, (says Floridus) sed tu quum ad ejusmodi defensionem confugis, et te furti alligas, (ut est res) et cum Roberto Stephano errare pulcherrimum putas." And afterwards he shows how Doletus had followed Stephen in his miscitation of Pliny for Ulpian. Hircius for Cesar, &c.

And now let the Reader judge of that clause wherewith the Doctor shuts up his whole discourse concerning *adduco*.

The reader may hereby easily discern, how little these scriblers do understand either of the agreement or difference of *fero* and *duco*, or the true Emphasis of either.

I hope we know that *duco* and *fero* were not written with the same letters; and as for the true Emphasis, (not that which was in use formerly) it is to be sought for in Tully, and Cesar, in which who are the better versed, or who hath approved himself the scribbler, let the reader judge.

§. 6.

AFTER so long a discourse concerning nothing, and so much Latin, to little purpose, we come to Greek, wherein the Doctor hath gained this repute that having outdone all others that pretend to Criticismes in Latin, he hath in his Greek gone beyond himself: So of that all the Criticks known in Lumber-story, none hath surpassed Doctor Wallis for Latin, except Doctor Wallis in Greek. The Epistoler having done Doctor Wallis no wrong, I shall abbreviate the controversie, by falling immediately upon the text of the Letter, which runs thus.

LL. I am now come to the main controversie about *Empusa*: the Doctor saith nothing in defense of his quibble, nor gives any reason why he jumbled languages to make a silly clinch, which will not pass for wit either at Oxford, or at Cambridge, no, nor at Westminster.

It seems he had derived *Empusa* from *ἐμ* and *πυξ*, and said it was a kinde of Hobgoblin that hopped upon one leg: and hence it was that the boy's play (fox came out of thy hole) now adays in use, came to be called *Empusa*. I suppose he means *Lusus Empusa*. This derivation he would have to be good, and that we may know his reading

ing (though he hath scarce consulted any of the Authors) he saith Mr. Hobbs did laugh at it, until some body told him it was in the Scholiast of Aristophanes, (as good a Critick as Mr. Hobbs) Eustathius, Erasmus, Calvus Rhodiginus, Stephanus, Scapula and Calepino. But sure he doth not think to scape so. To begin with the last, Galepine doth indeed say, *uno incedit pede, unde et nomen*. But he is Modern, and I do not see why his Authority should out-weigh mine, if his Authors reasons do not. He refers to Erasmus and Rhodiginus. Erasmus in the adage *Præter mutabilior*, hath these words of Empusa. *Narrant autem uno videri pede, (this is not to hop) unde et nomen inditum putant*, Εμφύς ὁνομαζέσθαι. He doth not testify his approbation of the derivation at all, only lets you know what conjectural Etymologies (*unde nomen inditum putant*) some have given before him. And doth any body think that Doctor Harmer was the first which began to shew his wit (or folly) in Etymologizing words? Calvus Rhodiginus doth not own the derivation, only saith, *Nominis ratio est, ut placet Eustathio, quia uno incedit pede*; (is this to hop?) Sed nec desunt qui alterum interpretentur habere anum pedem, & inde appellatam Empusam: quod in Batrachis Aristophanes expressit. And then he recites the interpretation the Aristophanes's Scholiast doth give upon the text, of which by and by. If any credit be to be attributed to this allegation, his last thoughts are opposite to Dr. Wallis; and Empusa must be so called, not because she hopped upon one leg, but because she had but one, the other being brass. But for the former derivation he refers to Eustathius.

As to Eustathius, I do easily conjecture that the reader doth believe, that the Dr. for Rhodiginus was an understanding and well-read man doth mean Eustathius upon Homer, for that is the book of most repute, his other pieces being no way considerable either for bulk or esteem. But it is not that book, nor yet his History of Ilium, but his notes upon the 725. verse of Dionysius περιγητης. The Poet had said of the stone Jaspis, that it was Εμφύς ἑμπίστος καὶ ἀλλοις ἐπιδολοῖσιν.

Upon which Eustathius thus remarks: Δοκεῖ ἀλεξίκακος εἶναι ἢ λίθος αὐτῇ, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἑμψαμὲνος παρματῶν ὡς ἂν ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ Εμψαμὲνος παρματῶν πρὸς τὴν Εμψαμὲν, ἐνὶ ποδὶ δὴν δὴν δαῖδα (forte dispendida Steph.) εἶναι καὶ περιγυμνάζει. εἰς τὴν εἴρα μανότερος ποδὶ ὥς ὡς τῷ ἐτέρῳ ποδὶ χαλκῷ ὄντι, καὶ τὸν μῦθον. This testimony doth not prove any thing of hopping, and as to the derivation, I cannot but say that Eustathius had too much of the Grammarian in him, and this is not the first time, neither in this book, nor elsewhere, wherein he hath trifled. It is observable out of the place that there were more Empusa's then one, as indeed the name is applied by several men to any kinde of frightful phantasm, and so it is used by several Authors; and for so much as phantasmes are various, according as the persons affrighted have been severally educated, &c. every man did impose this name upon his own apprehensions; and so Empusa came to be so diversified in the phantasies of men, as they were fearful of different apparitions, for who will believe that she was not apprehended as having four legs when she appeared in the form of a Cow, dog, &c. in which shapes she was at that time phansied by Bacchus and his man, as well as that of δρεκαῖον? I do not find that she appeared in any shape but such as made use of legs in going, whence I imagine that Empusa might be opposite to the Δαίμωνες, which appellation was antiently fixed upon the Gods (propitious) upon a twofold account. First, for that they were usually affigiated as having no feet: which leads me on to a discourse, which however digressive, is neither impertinent now, nor will be otherwise disuseful.

The antients, being sensible how the deity was not to be comprehended, and so not to be effigiated; and yet withall finding how prone men were to entertain themselves with corporeal thoughts of God, they did at first erect not statues to him, but Symbolical Columns, which might have that use as to reminde them that there was a God, and yet

ἔτιςιν τέτταρ' ἔς ἀνδράματ' αὐτοῦ δούλῳ γ' ἔν' ὁ τὸν Ποσειδά πνέοντες.

Καλλιθέη κληθεῖσα ὁ δρυμναῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς,

ἦεν Ἀργείης, ἢ σέμμασι καὶ θυγατρὶ

Προπύλῳ μιν αὖτις κίονα μακρὸν ἀνάστης.

Καὶ ὁ δ' Ἐυρωπῆαν πνέουσαν, ἰσορεῖ τὸ δὲ Διελροῖς ἀγαλμα Ἀπόλλωνος κίονα ἔκασ, δὴ τῶνδε,

Ὅρα δὴ δρυμνῶν ἀκροθίνια τε κορυμναῖα μιν

Σταθμῶν ἐκ ζαδίων καὶ κίονος ὑψηλοῖο.

Upon which *Hervetus* doth thus comment. Στάλην ἄνδ' Ὁρατος pro Statum et pro columnā dicitur Genes. 1. 19. uxor Lotbi dicitur versa in statum salis, ita enim habet nostra [vulgaris] versio; sed Septuaginta vertunt, καὶ ἐγένετο στήλη αἰῶς. Quod item nostra habet, lapis iste quem erexi in titulum, vocabitur domus dei. Genes. c. 28. ἐν Ὁρατο. α. πυλ. 70. εἰ, καὶ λίθος δὲ ἔστη στήλην, ὅς ἐστι, lapis quem erexi in statum, &c. εἰ ἀντιπροσώπων ἴδιον vocabulum, & in Hebraeo, et in Græca: ἵλλε δρυμνῶν, hic στήλη, Latine titulus, id quod in alicujus honorem erigitur. And then concludes, Lapis eiς qui erigebatur in dei honorem, et quo significabatur Deus, et Latine erat titulus, et Græcè στήλη, et Latine Columna. But to return to what I was speaking of at first. Ἐρμῆς was not the name of a particular deity at first, but of such a company, ἑρμῆς, which represented God symbolically, according to this or that attribute with occasional distinctions and diversifications: all were ἀρμῆς καὶ ἀνδρῶν, but the Greeks in process of time added the θεῶν, which were not used (that I know) by the Egyptians, from whom these kinds of statues had their original: I shall not go about to prove that they gave the same name of Ἐρμῆς to them: yet they had their *Hermes Trismegistus*, which was such a column (with several inscriptions of note: which was usual in old time; neither did they only serve to acquaint people with the way, but to instruct them in morality, and actions of daily concernments, and also in natural philosophy) the ignorance whereof hath begot several discourses concerning the life and books of that imaginary *Trismegistus*, who should give rise to the *Hermesick* philosophy. Of the same nature were the Roman Gods until the time of *Tarquinius Superbus*: such was their *Terminus*, *Janus*, *Vertumnus*: (which whether they were several I shall not dispute now:) and though *Janus* had two faces, (and sometimes four, as at *Falisci*) yet it was but one Column. Delubra sic dicta, quod ligna essent delubrata, id est decorticata, more veterum in simulacris deorum: some such thing is either expressly delivered, or hinted by *Asconius Pedianus* in *Verrina*.

Secondly they were called ῥινοδῶντες, for that they did not walk, but rather swim, if I may so express that non gradiuntur, sed fluunt; which is the assertion of all the commentators I have ever seen upon that verse of *Virgil*,

Et vera incessu patuit dea.

This whole discourse may be much illustrated from a passage in *Heliodor. Æthiop. l. 3. Scd. 12, 13. Calasiris* told *Cæmon* that the Gods *Apollo* and *Diana* did appear unto him, *Cæmon* replied, Ἀλλὰ τίνα δὲ θεῶν ἔφασκες εἶναι ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι μὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος; ἀλλ' ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι; upon this the old priest answered, that both Gods and Demons, when they appear to men may be discovered by the curious observer, both in that they never shut their eyes, καὶ τὸ βεβήσαντα βλέπον, ἢ καὶ δίδασκον τὸ πᾶν ἐν δὲ μὴ ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥυμνῶν πνέοντες, καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἀνθρώποις, περὶ τῶν πολλῶν τὴν πλείονη ἢ διαπερνομένων. Διὸ δὴ καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν θεῶν Ἀργεῖοι τοὺς ῥυμνῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἱστῶν, ὁ δὲ καὶ Ὀμήρου ἐν ἱλίου, ὅτε Ἀργεῖοι, καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τε καὶ τὸν δαίμονα καὶ τὸν θεόν, συμφορικῶς τοῖς ἑπείσιν ἐναπείσιντο,

ἰσχυροῦ, τῆς διακρίσεως συνήκει ἡ γυνή, καὶ τὸ πῦρ, ὅτι ἡ Πόρνη δὲν
 ἔστι.

Ἰχθὺς δὲ μετέπειτα ποδὶν ἢ δὲ κνημῶν
 ἔστι γυνὴ ἀμώρητος.

Ὅσον εἶπον ὅτι τὰ πορνεῖα, εἴτε γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ εἶναι ἀμώρητος, ἢ ἡ γυνή πρὸς ἀνδραγαθίαν, ἢ παρὰ τὴν ὑπερλαμπρότητα. *Farnaby* upon the place in *Vergil* observes that *Draco* *non incesus est continuus et equalis, non dimoti pedibus, neque transpositis, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥυθμῶν ἀβέβαιον*. *Cornelius Schrevelius* in the new *Leyden* notes, saith, *Antiquissima quæque deorum simulachra, quod observant viri magni, erant τὰς ποδῶν οὐ μεταβαλλόμενα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑαυτὰ ἑαυτῶν non gradiuntur, sed stant*. How their most ancient statues were effigiated, hath been above explained at large: those that were afterwards erected became more polished, being not only faced, but so carved as to represent the upper parts of a man compleat, (if they were made after that way) but without hands; their nether parts were not divided into legs, but one continued piece, lessening continually, until it came to the base, which carried a little of the representation of a foot in some; in others, not at all. Thus I have seen *Ifts* represented, and *Orus* in ancient sculpture; and others are said to have been expressed in the same shape. The Gyants contrarywise were represented with the nether parts as of a serpents tail wound up in circles; whence they were called *angripedes*: The symbolical meaning of the one and other being, that the Gods did what they pleased directly, and by way of absolute power, but the wicked by crooked and indirect means. To this way of picturing the Gods, did that headen Emperour allude, who meeting with a man impotent and bed-ridden, cut off his feet by the ankles, and pared off the flesh on the inside of his legs, saying, *that since he was not able to walk like a man, he would make him stand like a God*. Yet after that they came to be represented in the full shape of creatures.

These things being premised, I suppose it easy for the intelligent Reader to find out the true Etymology of *Empusa*, *quæsi* ὅτι ποδὶν ἔσται or *βαρύνου*, from going on her feet, whereas the other Gods and Demons had a different gate. If any can dislike this deduction, and think her so named from *ἐνέρες*, whereas she always went upon two legs (if her shape permitted it) though she might draw the other after her, as a man doth a wooden leg: I say if any, notwithstanding what hath been said, can joyn issue with the Doctor, my reply shall be,

Σὺ δὲ μὴ ταῦτα δυνάστη ἔσθαι, ἐμὴ δὲ τὰ δὲ.

Now as to the words of *Aristophanes* upon which the Scholiast descants, they are these: speaking of an Apparition strangely shaped, sometimes like a *Camel*, sometimes like an *Ox*, a beautiful woman, a dog, &c. *Bacchus* tells his man, *Ἐμπύσα τείνον γ' ἐστὶ*. *Ἔα*. καὶ γυνὴν λέμνην ἴδον ἀνέστησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλου ἔχου. *Δι*. Νῦν τὴν Πόρνην δὲ, καὶ βολίπρον ἀνέστη. *Ἔα*. Σὺ δὲ ἴδου. The Scholiast hereupon tells us that *Empusa* was φάντασμα δαιμονίου ἢ καὶ ἑνὸς ἐκ τῶν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ οὐρανῶν τῶν δαιμόνων, ὅτι ἡ δαίμων πολλὰς μεταβάσεις ἔχει καὶ ἀντὶ τούτου ἀντὶ τὸν μεταβάσεων ἔχου, καὶ ἐν μολογῇ τῇ δαιμόνιᾳ ποδῶν, ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ καλεῖται. And this is all that is material in the Scholiast, except that he adds by the by, that *βολίπρον καὶ*, is all one with the *leg of an Ass*.

This text and Scholiast is that to which all the Authors he names, and more, do refer; and is all the ground can be alledged for that derivation of *Ἐμπύσα* *quæsi* ἐνέρες.

I come now to *Stephen*, who in his Index, and in the word *πυλίζω*, gives us the derivation

situation of *Empusa*. *Πασιζω gradior, incido, (not to hop) ἴσθι Σίλῃ* "Empusos il-
 dem enim habet. But neither Stephen, nor any else (except Suida, whom the Hy-
 percritical Doctor had not seen, who hath a multitude of absurd deductions, as *ἴσθι*,
Σίλας, a candle, πῦρ ἐν γαστρὶ Σίλας, &c. and *Eustathius*, whose authority is allevia-
 ted before) no not the Scholiast of *Aristophanes* (that better Critick then Mr. Noddy)
 doth relate the Etymology as their own. Nay, there is not one faith that *Empusa*
 HOPPED upon one leg, which is to be proved out of them. The great Etymo-
 logical dictionary deriveth it *πῦρ τὸ ἐμπυλίζω, to hinder, ἴσθι*, &c. Its apparition
 being a token of ill luck. But as to the Doctors deduction, it saith, "Εμπύσος ἴσθι-
 ται, ὅτι ἄλλο πῦρ τὸ ἐν γαστρὶ." It doth only *seem* so: And it is strange that
 it should not alter only its *affirmation*, but change its *v* into *μ*, which I can hardly be-
 lieve admittable in Greek, lest there should be no difference betwixt its Derivatives
 and those of *ἐν* the proposition.

When I consider the Gods, their *Hermes*, in Greece, how they stand in the streets
 at every turning, being only *capiti obelisk*, how they were placed in their high-
 ways, fields, &c. I can think that the origin of this name may have been thus. Some
 fearful person going out in the dark, phantasied to himself an Apparition, which his
 companion might tell him was nothing but one of the several *Hermes*, that stood upon
 every turn; against this the other might reply, that they were nothing but *squared*
Columns with heads set upon them, but this new phantasmie *ἐν νύκτι τοῖς πυλῶν*,
 this is none of those *ἀγῶν*, those *tranci Hermes*, this hath feet. Or it may have had
 its name *πῦρ τὸ ἐν ποσσὶ ἑνῇ, five Calves*, because that after they had attributed
 compleat shapes, and feet to their Gods, yet they did not then suppose them to go
 accordingly as we go, moving first one foot, and then another. This is the observa-
 tion of *Dionys. Prætorius* in his notes upon the second oration of *Julian, Apost.* refer-
 ring to that verse in *Homer*, speaking of *Neptune*,

Τεὶς μὲν ὀρέξῃ ἰόν, τὸ δὲ τῖσιν ἵκντο Πάριος.

*Grædiderunt vester Deus non sed d'ur, ac promouendo pedes ingredi, sed continuo velim in-
 petu fluere.* But they did imagin then to move *ἐν τῇ πύλῃ ἰόντων ἀέρος*; and there-
 fore our Night-walker being surprized with an unexpected phantasmie, cries out in a
 different expression from that of *Aeneas* in *Virgil*, *incesso pennis Cecidamach*: it goeth
 upon feet after the usual manner, and so is no good, *propositio Apollo, ἐοικῶς*, but
ill-aboding TALL, for which apprehension of his some body might sily coyn this
 name of "Empusos. It may also possibly have been deduced from *ἐμπυλίζω*, so that
ἐμπυλίζω [*ἴσθι*] be reduced in time to the single term of *Empusa*. Nor do I
 much doubt, but that those who are conversant in languages, and know how that fe-
 veral expressions are often jumbled together to make up one word upon such like ca-
 ses, will think this a very probable origination. I believe then that Mr. Hob's friend
 did never tell him that that *absurd* derivation was to be found in the Author's alledged
 by the Doctor. But that the Doctor took this occasion to let us know how many
 books there are to which he pretends, but will not certainly profess that he hath read
 or looked upon in this case. *Empusa* was no hopping phantasmie; it had two legs and
 went upon both, as a man may upon a wooden leg. *Εμπύσος* was also a name for
Lemnis, and such was that which *Menippus* should have married, which I suppose did
 neither hop, nor go upon one leg, for then he might easily have discovered it. *Philost.*
4. de vit. Apollon. *Ὅταν τὰ μῦθ' ἐμπυλίζω ἴσθι, ὡς Ἀλεξάνδρ' τὸ ἐμπυλίζω ἐν ὄντι;*
 where *ἐμπύσος, Ἀλεξάνδρ' ἐμπυλίζω* are Synonyms, and *μῦθ' ἴσθι* seems to me not a per-
 tinuity of species but individuals.

But Mr. *Hobs* did not except against the derivation (although he might justly; derivations made after the imposition of names carry more of *phantse* than *truth*; and the Doctor is not excused for asserting what others barely relate, none approve.) But asked him where, that is, in what Authors, he read that *Boy's play* is so called? To which question the Doctor (to shew his reading, and the good Authors he is conversant in) replies, In *Junius's Nomenclator*, *Rider*, and *Thomas's Dictionary*, sufficient Authors in such a business. It is to be remembered that the tryal now is in *Westminster School*, and amongst *Ciceronians*, neither whereof will allow those to be sufficient Authors of any Latin word. Alas! They are but *vetabularies*: and if they bring no Author for their allegation, all that may be allowed them is, that by way of allusion our modern play may be called *Ludus Empusa*: but that it is so called, we must expect till some Author do give it that name. These are so good Authors, that I have not either of them in my library; but I have taken the pains to seek out and consult, first *Rider*; I looked in him, who was only Author of the English dictionary, and I could finde no such thing. 'Tis true, in the Latin dictionary which is joynted with *Rider*, but made by *Holyoke*; (O that the Doctor would but mark!) In the appendix of obsolete words, there is *Empusa ludus*, vid. *Ascoliasmus*: and there I finde *Ascoliasmus*, *Ludus Empusa*, *sex to thy hole*. The same is in *Thomasius*, who refers to *Junius* in like manner. But could the Doctor think the word obsolete, when the play is still in fashion? Or doth he think this play so antient, as to have had a name that thorough length of time should grow obsolete? As for *Junius's* interpretation of *Empusa*, it is this, *Empusa, spectrum quod se infalibibus ingerit, uno pede ingrediens*. Had the Doctor ever read him, he would have quoted him for his derivation of *Empusa*, I suppose. In *Ascoliasmus* he saith, *Ascoliasmus, Ludus Empusa, si ubi aliter prede in aere librato, unico subsiliunt, ασκολιασμός*, *Pollux*. *Almanick*, *Hindelen*: *Belgice*, *Op een been springhen*. *Hindspindelen* *Flandris*. But what it is in English, he doth not tell, although he doth in other places often. What the Doctor can pick out of the *Dutch* I know not: but if that do not justifie him, as I think it doth not, he hath wronged *Junius*, and grossly imposed upon his Readers.

But to clear up this controversy further, I cannot be perswaded the Doctor ever looked upon *Junius*, for if he had, I am confident according to his wonted accuracy, he would have cited *Pollux's onomasticon* into the bargain, for *Junius* refers to him, and I shall set down his words, that so the reader may see what *Ascoliasmus* was, and all the Doctors Authors say *Ludus Empusa* and *Ascoliasmus* were one and the same thing. *Jal. Pollux lib. 9. c. 7. O δὲ Ασκολιασμός* (old editions read it as doth *Junius*, *ασκολιασμός*) τὸ ἐτέρῳ ποδὶ ἀνωρμίνῃ, καὶ μόνῳ τῷ ἐτέρῳ ποδὶ ἐπιβῆναι, ὅπου Ασκολιασμοῦ ἀνέμαζον, ὅπου εἰς μὴν ὁ ἐπὶ λαλῶντο ἢ ὁ μὴ ἐπὶ λαλῶν ἔτω, οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ πτερῶν ἐπὶ ἀμφοῖν διατρέτες, ὡς πρὸς τῷ φερεμίνῳ ποδὶ ὁ δισκῶν δινηθῆναι πρὸς ἢ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπιβῆναι, ἀεὶ μὴν τῷ ποδὶ ματα, αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῷ πλάθει τοῦ γαλῶν. Ασκολιασμοῦ δὲ ὁ καλεῖται καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ πτερῶν ἐπὶ καὶ ὑπὸ πτερῶν πτερούματ', ἀνεμίνῃ, ἢ περὶ λαλῶν ἐπὶ ἀεὶ ἢ ἀεὶ πρὸς. So that *Ascoliasmus*, and consequently their *Ludus Empusa*, "was a certain sport which consisted in *hopping*, whether it were by striving who could *hop furthest*, or whether only one *did* *pu*, [sic] the rest *hopping*, and they fled before him on both legs, which game he was to continue till he had caught one of his fellows; or whether it did consist in the boyes striving who could *hop longest*; or lastly whether it did consist in *hopping* upon a certain bladder, which being blown up and well oyled over, was placed upon the ground for them to hop upon, that so the unctuous bladder might slip from under them, and give them a fall. And this is all that *Pollux* holds forth. Now of all these wayes there is none that hath any thing of resemblance with our *Fox to thy hole*; but the second: and yet in its description

scrip
of a f
with
of the
thy bo
(and
shall
(but
τῷ Δ
ἔτω
ἀεὶ
But
name
speak
third
other
assess
quid
dit.
bette
great
body
lat?
infini
with
a case
Th
so the
sented
additio
should
except
is conse
by sever
five all
goblin u
of King
one leg
be cont
nine, i
I say no
Clich i
ders the
you hea
is in t
Erat
"dus p
"QU
"ab ev
(Ang

scription of his issuing out of a certain *kenel*, nor of his having a *glove* tied at the end of a string wherewith to reach the play fellows; nor of their being accommodated with the like habiliments, &c. wherein the play consists as well as in hopping. Any of them notwithstanding might be called *Ludus Empusa*, but not in any sort *fox* or *thole*. So that the Doctor and his Authors are out; imposing that upon *Junius*, (*and Pollux*) which he never said. And thus much may suffice as to this point: I shall only add out of *Mensuri's Ludi Græci*, that *Ascolia* were (not *Ludus Empusa*, but) *Bacchi Sacra*, and he quotes *Aristophanes's* Scholiasts in *Pluto*. Ἀσכולία ἱερὰ τῇ Διωνύσῳ, ἀσκήν δὲ οὖν πλῆρυντες, ἐνὶ ποδὶ τῶν πνεύματων, καὶ ὁ πῶτος ἀβλῶν ἔχει τὸν δῖον. As also *Hesychius*; Ἀσכולιδεῖν, κυέως τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀσκέος ἀλλοεῖν.

But I could have told the Doctor where he might have read of *Empusa* as being the name of a certain sport or game, and that is, in *Turnebus adv. lib. 27. c. 33*. There he speaks of several games mentioned by *Justinian* in his Code, at the latter end of the third book; one of which he takes to be named *Empusa*. Adding withal, that the other are games it is indisputable: only *Empusa* in lite et causa erit, quod nemo nobis facile assensurus sit *Ludum* esse. cum constet spectrum quoddam fuisse formas variè mutans. Sed quid vetat eo nomine *Ludum* fuisse? Certe ad vestigia viiata scriptura quàm proximè accedit. Yet he only is satisfied in this conjecture, till some body else shall produce a better. And now what shall I say? Was not *Turnebus* as good a Critick and of as great reading as *Doctor Wallis*? Who had read over *Pollux*, and yet is afraid that nobody will believe *Empusa* to have been a game; and all he alledgeth for it is *Quid veritat*? Truly all I shall say, and to conclude this business, is, that he had read over an infinity of books, yet had not had the happiness which our Doctor had, to consult with *Junius's Nomenclator*, *Thomasius* and *Rider's dictionary*, Authors sufficient in such a case.

Thus I have put my self to the pains of transcribing the whole text of the letter, that so the question as stated by me, and impugned by him, might be more fully represented to the readers eye. I have altered some things in it, besides the digressive addition, which my haste caused me either to quit, or express otherwise than I should have done upon meditation: they are such passages to which the Doctor hath excepted nothing; I come now to examine what he hath said against my discourse. It is confessed on both sides that there were more *Empusa's* than one: that the name was applied by several men to any kinde of frightful phantasm; every man (according as they had been severally educated) imposing this name upon his own apprehensions. That the word *Hobgoblin* is of the like use and extent, I do not know; I have not read in the *Chronicles* of King *Oberon*, nor the annals of *Fairy Knights*, that ever our *Hob-goblins* did hop on one leg, or had the one foot of an *Ass*, the other of *brass*. And therefore my assertion must be contradictory to the Doctors (who having made up some general concessions of mine, infer) "And therefore by *A L L* signs and tokens, *Empusa* was an *Hob-goblin*. I say not by *All signs*, for ought that I know, or the Doctor informs us. As for the *Clinch* it is not for me to determin what was in the Doctors intentions: he that considers the Doctors humour, and way of writing, will think it probable he intended one: you heard how he defended it by the example of *Erasmus*: take the whole passage as it is in the *Elenchus*, and judge as you please of it.

Erast Empusa——pedibus altero æneo, altero asinino, sed unus (utri videtur) duos pedes habuerit, non tamen nisi uno incedebat, ut aliunde si opus sit discas (unde *L. I. QU E T* ex eorum lemmatum numero fuisse quas nos Anglicè dicimus *Hob-goblins*) nempe ab æt ætæ factum est nomen illud: unde et priorum ludus ille, *Empusæ ludus* dictus (*Anglicè Foxe, foxe, come out of your hole, hoc est, heus vulpes de foveâ prodi*)

"*nomen sortitus, quo puer ille qui vulpes audit, altero suspensio pedis, altero subsidium incedit,*
 " (*quod est Anglicè to hop*) *et reliquis flagellandis si utroque terram intigerit.*

Mr. Hobz in his lessons could not but take notice of this passage, and reflect upon it to this purpose. "When a stranger shall read this, and hoping to finde therein some witty conceit, shall with much ado have gotten it interpreted and explained to him, what will he think of our Doctors of Divinity at Oxford, that will take so much pains, as to go out of the language they set forth in, for so ridiculous a purpose? You will say it is a pretty Paronomasia. How you call it there I know not, but it is commonly called here a *Clinch*; and such a one, as is to insipid for a boy of twelve years old, and very unfit for the sanctity of a Minister, and the gravity of a Doctor of Divinity.

Because I have to do with a Divine, I shall branch out the Doctors text into these following propositions: First, then *Empusa* had two feet. Secondly, though she had two feet, *nontamen nisi unus incedebat*, that is, she hopped upon one: for he wonders in his last reply how the Epistoler can understand it otherwise then of hopping: and that it comes from *h* and *u*. Thirdly, *Inde liquet*, it is therefore (*viz.* because she hopped) clear that *Empusa* was such a spectre as we in English call an *Hob-goblin*. Fifthly, that by Analogy to this hopping *Elue*, the boys play of *sin to thy hole* hath its name of *Ludus Empusa*. His last reply furnisheth me with some other additional observations. As that, of any affinity betwixt *Hob-goblin* and Mr. Hobz, he spake not a word: and therefore is not responsible for any *clinch*, or *clinch*. Very good! Doth any man that maketh *clinch*s, write in the margin, *this is a clinch: I allude to this, or that*? Doth he not suppose his reader so intelligent as to know the other name, (*viz.* *Hobz*) upon which might a *clinch*? If it be not certain, it is very suspicious that he intended that way; for otherwise I do not see how pertinent that discourse is to the matter, if it be not a reflection of the person against whom he writ. Another thing is, "that he doth not say that *Hobz*, or *Hob-goblin* came from *Hop*." This is such another equivocation as the former. *He doth not say it!* But it seems to be implied. Yet who said he did? Who charged him with being out in his English deduction? Not Mr. Hobz! Not the Epistoler! They quarrelled with him for making *Empusa* to come from *h* and *u*s, not for deriving *Hob-goblin* from *hop*. But this would give occasion for a digression that might seem extraordinary to the vulgar; and instruct the *Richardsons*, *Dicksons*, &c. with a new answer to that old query, *Who gave you that name?* The whole is a pretty imperitancy: I am not so far his adversary as to deny him commendations where he does well. This hath something of ordinary reading in it, (if he had penned nothing but this and his English Grammar, I should have reserved a civil esteem for him, as to the study of our native language, how mean thoughts soever I might have had of his Latin and Greek) It is an account of what *Minsheu* told us long agoe, with an inconsiderable addition out of *Vossius*. He (*Minsheu*) told us, that *Hob-goblin* was quasi *Rob-goblin*, &c. and that *Goblin* in English was *G. Gobelin*: which our linguist explained (to shew how good he is at deciphering characters, especially having the key in *Minsheu*, that *G. hood for Gallic*) *Gobel* is a French word, used in the same sense (I suppose: for *Minsheu* doth not speak clear!) with them, that *Hob-goblin* is with us, for any highfal phantasmie. His illustrations are obvious; and the case had been more clear, if he had only said that *Rob* hath been used for *Robert*, and likewise *Ob* and *Hob* (the which are now used in the North) wherein the change is no greater then is that of *Shalge* for *Roger*, I mean as to sound. So in the Latin tongue he who is called by *Tully* *Robur*, is by *Priscian* called *Habonius*, where he cites the same passage out of the *Verrius*, as *Gruter* observes. He might have said much more for the instruction of his adversary in his right name: and that name sake of his *Hob-goblin*. He might have shew-

ed how *Gob* hath been used for *God*, and then the diminutive *Goblin* or *Gobling*, had been as easily found out as *Goslin*, or *Gosling*, &c. He might have shewed that it hath been used to affright children therewith, as if it would devour them; to *goble* and to *eat* basily, being all one. Or he might have made it *Greek* as well as *French*; and deduced it from *ὄβρις*, that *wanton Devils* for such sometimes is the merry *Hob*; or from *Ὀψ*, or *Ὀψις*, the goddess of the woods, *Diana*. *Thomasus* (his all-sufficient Author!) thinks it came from the *Guibellines*. But it may be it had become the late *Scribe* to the *Sambodrin*, to have resolved the case by the Assemblies annotations; and derived the English from the Hebrew *אֲבִיר* *Ob*, which with them was the name of a *Python*, or *Demon* that spake with a shrill voice out of sepulchres and subterraneous Caverns. So *Saul* saith, 1 Sam. 28. 7. *seek out a woman that hath an אֲבִיר* *Ob*. And there was a woman at *Endor* that had an *אֲבִיר* *Ob*, or familiar spirit. So *Isa.* 19. 3. *They shall seek to them that have familiar spirits*, *ἀποκρίσεις τοῖς ἐν γῆς πορεύουσιν*, that is, *אֲבִיר*, the *Ob*s; and 2 Kings 21. 6. *Manasseh restored אֲבִיר*, the *Ob*s; and *mirrards*. The *Greek*, as *Selden* and others cite it, hath *ὄβριος* *ὄβρις* & *ὄβρις*. That is, he did neglect the true *God*, and would not attribute effects to him; that is, *glorify* him in his actions, but ascribed them to *Ob*s, and found out such persons as did not only attest from *brassy*, but pretend a knowledge and familiarity with those *Ob*s: this may be intimated in the *Greek* *ὄβριος*, though perhaps the Hebrew be not so significant. Yea, the Doctor might have argued out of Scripture, that it was not lawful to converse with Mr. *Hobs*, since *Ob*s were prohibited of old: such reasonings are found in his *thesis*. There may also have been some allusion to that *inertus aerum* of which I spake afore: and our Country-men may have attributed to their Gods one *gob*, and to their *Goblins* another made up of *going* and *hopping*, which is to *Hoble* along, and thence might have come *Hob-goblins*, i. e. *Hoble-goblins*.

In the second place, the Doctor observes that though *Empusa* had many shapes, yet Mr. *Hobs* (viz. in that excellent Epistle to the Earl of Devonshire prefixed to his natural philosophy) confines himself to one, which had indeed two legs, the one of *drift*, the other of *an Ass*, (as not only Mr. *Hobs* but *Aristophanes* informs us) Mr. *Hobs* had no reason to mention any more at the present, and I do not see why he should have been impertinent, to instruct the Doctor the better.

But the Doctor saith, "*Empusa* went but upon one leg, as appears by the places" ("though I should have cited more:) from whence, as most agree, it took the name.

It is very considerable that the Doctor is never so far exhausted, but that there are more allegations (equally pertinent!) which he could have cited. So he told us in *linguam*; so in *adducit*: though the same motives that made him blot his copy, so much as he did before it was printed, might have induced him to omit a number of passages which he suffered to remain. "Again I would fain know, what those places are, from whence most agree, it took the name. I told him in the letter, that all depended upon that one place of *Aristophanes*. I would he had been so willing, as I presume he is able (for he knew of more) to inform me: for all the Authors he named refer to this one; but as I must condole the loss *Philology* received when the Doctor silenced his pen as to those additional quotations, (viz. out of Doctor *Davis*, *Thomas*, *Junius*, and *Holyoke*, from whence, that is, from the passages in whom *Empusa* took her name) so I fear the reader will question my candour, that will not trust the Doctor in those places which he had particularly consulted, and found them to express or imply the same derivation. The first place he here insists on is at large set down in the letter: but that the Doctor may learn how it is not enough to consult a place, unless he understand it, I shall put my self and the reader to the trouble of a review —

"*Empusa*, *Sar-
pentina*

use thereof. Καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς οἷον ἐν ποσσὶ, διὰ τὸ ἐν ποσσὶ καὶ ἔχειν and de-
 tive it *quasi* ἰρίπυς, one leg; because it did once, *whilome*, so appear, as to have the
 one leg of an ass, and the other of brags, which is to have the *use of one leg*; as he whose
 nerve is cut, may have lost the *use of an arm*, yet not so totally, as not to be able to
 lean on it, or upon some occasions to benefit himself thereby. Thus δὲ αὖτις αὖτις,
 αὖτις, do not infer the total disuse of any servant; and *Horatius* is said to have been
 troubled αὖτις ἡ ποδὶν, which was but a debility in them, yet such as rendered him
 unserviceable in war, or active employments in peace. I could almost divine, that
 he (the Scholiast) seems to expose the Etymologists for their whimsies in derivations,
 that should offer to deduce *Empusa* from ἰρίπυς, because she went once upon one leg,
 (τὴν ἑτέραν ποδὶς χαλκῷ ὄντι) whereas there are as many inducements for my Etymo-
 logy, as there are *shapes* she appeared in, (which is fair odds against the Doctor) and
 one more which is the analogy with the ancient statues of the Gods, and the solving of
 the Authors sense, which cannot be justified if the Doctors minde hold; for to what
 use should that *other leg* seem? It is further dubitable, whether that same *dragen leg*
 were continuous with the body of *Empusa*, or no? If not, then she had but one leg,
 and so was (when in that shape) ἰρίπυς, yet went upon two, viz. the additional one
 of *drags* also. Now that it was, or could be continuous, is a question to be disputed in
 another place: there being natural philosophers that assert, that when a bough withers up-
 on the tree, it ceaseth to be a part, and to be continuous therewith. But take it either
 way, it is but a *quivocè membrum*, and therefore I should grant that she were called
Empusa from ἰρίπυς, yet it would not follow that she went upon one only, or hopped.
 As for his additional of what he could have cited, I shall tell him of better; that is of
Favorinus, who transcribed the Scholiast, and *Hesychius*; (besides *Suidas* and Etymo-
 logus, whom I advised him of in the letter) *Hesychius* says, Ἐμπύσα δαίμωνιον, &c.
 ὡς πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἐν ποσσὶ ῥέουσαν, which makes as much for him as doth the Scholiast
 of *Arsiophanes*, who bringing neither reason to confirm the others saying, nor avouch-
 ing it himself, ought not to be any way entitled to the owning of it.

Then follows a digression about *Riders* dictionary: it was a matter of no great mo-
 ment at first, but now I shall consider what our *Divine* says about it. "I might have
 added another book, which I do not know how to call; should I call it *Rider's* di-
 ctionary? you would tell me *Holyoke* made part of it; should I call it *Holyoke's*, others
 would say *Doctor Gray*, if I mistake not, and some others with him, have added al-
 most as much to *Holyoke*, as he had done to *Rider*, and digested the whole anew,
 and the book so digested is that I mean: whether what I cited out of it were in *Ho-
 lyoke's* edition or not, I do not know, otherwise then that I am now told, it is in an
 appendix of obsolete words; the book that I intended to cite, hath it in the body of the
 dictionary Etymologicum: yet I was loath to call it Dr. *Gray's* dictionary, for fear it
 should not be understood what book I meant. I cited it then by the name of *Rider*,
 because the first title-page intitles the book to him, and the rest as an appendix.

He knows not how to call it! Why does not he? Is not the name prefixed *HO-
 LYOKES* dictionary? Will he not allow it the benefit that other books have, to be
 called by the names they bear? Did any, at least did ever the *vogue* of the people ascribe
 that piece to Dr. *Gray*? Was it ever printed under his, or any other name? Because I
 censured you for calling it by a wrong name, should I therefore have quarrelled with
 you if you had named it aright? I did not charge you for citing *Scapula*, where the work
 was *Stephens*? I did not. I let *Calpine* pass, though his be all stolen, and hath recei-
 ved now as great an accessional, as ever *Holyokes* did. *Doleus ex Martii Nizolii, Bar-
 tholomei Riccii, Roberti Stephani lucubrationibus, tam pulchros Latinae linguae commentari-
 os, panè Ambrosio Calepino pat, insulsiſſimè compilavit.* Yecif he had cited the one, as

he

he did the other, I should not have found fault with him. And so in the citing of any book I allow it what title the frontispice gives it: for then I know, and so may others, know where to look, and not blunder as I did betwixt *Rider* and *Holyoke*: and at last I met with a different edition from what the Doctor used. Mine had the obsolete words by themselves, his had received them all into the body of the book, but with an *Asterisk* or *obelisk*, thus. “† *Empusa Ludus Jun. vide Alcolisimus*; and “there it is “*Alcolisimus Jun. Grec. Empusa ludus, fox to thy bole*. What the meaning of that *obelisk* is I desire to shew out of *Holyokes* advice to the reader. *Causa vocabula quæ in probatis authoribus nunquam sunt reperta, et à fluxione Latina aliena, obelo in fronte notavi. Idemque ea barbara quibus ob peritorum defectum, necessitate coacti, utimur, eodem nota infensivi*. You see what the Doctor hath gotten by pleading variety of editions; as also, how I let *Thomas* and *Holyoke* (though it to be confessed, that where they both agree, the latter did but transcribe the former) pass for two, without a censure, so that the Doctor needed not have been so fearful; but that he was sensible of his being out, yet would seem to say something. In the last edition *Rider* is but an appendix to *Holyoke*, so saith the title page of A. Crake's edition: but the *binders* do often transpose the books, which gave occasion and opportunity to the Doctor to say the greater was added to the lesser, and that *Holyoke* should perfect *Rider*, and so make his own work an occasional only, whereas he assumed the other merely to complete his own.

Of his many Authorities he instances in no more, though he might have transcribed them out of my letter: only talks idly.

But all these Authorities are nothing worth with this epistoler. *Calpine* is but more “darn, and therefore he saes not why *Calpines* authority should outweigh his own.

I am very sorry to hear the Doctor relinquish reason for bare Authority; I confess I do not know the validity of men above men further then he must derive from his reason: doth the Doctor think there is *Magick* in names, so as the most letters or syllables should prevail against the *frames*? Or doth he ballance men in the scales, and so take them not for isonique value, but weight? If so, I believe he that shall weigh Dr. Wallis by the stone, will not give him that respect which his own spiritivity will assume. I know not why Authority should sway more in *Philology*, then *Divinity*: I cannot believe the whole Assembly of Divines, say all the Divines in Europe can outway by their authority my single exposition of *Ephe. 4. 10. &c. or Mat. 28. 19. &c.* I said only this of *Calpine*, that I “did not see why his Authority should outweigh mine, if his Authors reasons did not. The Doctor had something of the Devil in him, when he quoted my text by halves; and then takes occasion to charge me with *self-conceit*: whereas I say no more of my self, then I would of Doctor Wallis, or the meekest idiot in the world, viz. that I know no difference betwixt the fool and the wise, but only reason. Yet that I may acquit my self of *Calpine*, I shall adde to what I already have brought against *Calpine* in the case of *Doleus*, a further testimony of *Franciscus Floridus* concerning him: “*Videmus* “*post Nicolaum Perottum, omnium interpretation minus salubre voluisse Ambrosium Calpini- num, illum laborem ac vigiliarum furem manifestissimum: in omnibus tamen maxime ab- sordum, cum infuso suo discrimine, in quo ne gry quidem & su protulit, nisi siquis ab in- strum Scripturibus sordes collegit, qui non minus fides Apalcio, aut Martino Capella, in- vertitur proprietas, quem M. Cicero, aut Casiri tribuit, &c.* — *Itaque Perotti nomen auxit non mediocriter, cuiuslibet ab eruditio in reddendâ verborum ratione deferuntur, cum Calpine vix credent, quod veterum testimoniis confirmet: et hoc LUDIBRI- illius honoris causâ nominare solent.* And thus I free my self from *Calpine*, who is a School book; and indeed of no authority further then those precincts extend; but I set a give the Doctor for using him here whose education had not permitted him the trial, or

of begot
Riding
authors,
letter's t
man repo
that the
out any
them, I
their pos
rinent co

A jum
inward
together
dis Syri
Grammar
“Gram
from wh
his had
converse
name, w
majesty
that obse
“imper
Doctor h
have bro
mine.
“shoul
“I love a
“and th
observed
and shew
stances w
to counte
hardly be
yel. I
by Seld
replies,
“confes
“the El
“Nera
“yet no
“doth i
“Ew,
“dude
“ya, I
I see
jection o
do. Can
it is ver
not in th

a School-boy did so confute that allegation out of Menander in Suidas; *μαρτυρεῖται δὲ ἔρως*. I will be here before you can tell one, two, three. Which is conformable to what Stephen renders it, viz. *celeriter*, and Suidas *μαρτυρεῖται*: though neither give the Etymology. This I knew besides many other variations in compounds, which it would be tedious to reckon up. But another thing which was most urgent with me, was, that I knew those *aspirations* were of late addition, and of a much newer standing than the common dialects, being the invention of Grammarians (I mean as to the writing of them) upon the declining of the Grecian learning: as for the pronunciation, it was different in several territories, that which *aspirated* in one place was *unmarked* in another & vice versa, so that the exception against the non-aspiration could be of no validity, unless it could be proved that *ε* was always aspirated, and (which is more) that *Ε* *Ε* *Ε* was framed in place where that aspiration was used: which that it was not, nor could be universal in Greece, both natural reasons, and records make impossible, the common dialect was an extract out of all those scattered dialects of Greece, and had so much of Greek in it as to be (for the most part) understood every where: as our ordinary English phrase is apprehended all over England, though the same be differently pronounced not only as to the aspiration and levigation, but sound of letters, and more differently written: and he that goes to make a certain English Grammar, however he may pretend to universality, regulates it by his own ear, use, and custom of such as he approves of, (which is not to approve of them, but himself) and hath been conversant with. Thus I have given an account of the causes why I put no greater stress upon that objection, which the Doctor thought to be of some importance. I come now to his examination of what I secondly objected not as impossible, but dubious and suspicious, and hardly (when joyned with the other change of spirit) to be believed.

Dr. H. repl. But the other upon which he puts the greatest stress, (not only but also) is ridiculous. Could any man believe that the change of *ν* into *μ* is hardly admissible in Greek? Nay, is it possible to be otherwise, when *ν* is to come immediately before *π*? Did this Paracritick ever see *νπ* to come together in any Greek word whatever? Is *ν* perpetually so changed when ever any such case shall happen, because the analogy of the Greek tongue will bear it? A very little skill in Greek would have been able to rectifie such a gross mistake. And he can never with any face pretend to be a Critick, who doth not know it. Me thinks that either Mr. Hobs. or that third person thorough whose hands this paper it seems came, might have had so much as not to suffer such a childish business as this to pass both their hands uncorrected. And what he adds, *lest there should be no difference betwixt its derivatives and those of ε*, helps it a very little, for such a conclusion is much more allowable in Greek, then that *νπ* should come next together: nor would this help it at all (if it were allowable) save only where the next letter is a labial: for else there would be no occasion of changing *ν* into *μ* in either of them. 'Tis well therefore if that be true that we are told, that he hath better ornaments than to be willing to go clad abroad in the habit of a Grammarian: for if he have no better ornaments than these, he may be one of the ragged Regiment for ought I see.

I have set down the Doctors words at large, that so you might see how (upon slender grounds) apt he is to presume upon his puerile thoughts, and how little he hath improved his School-dialects. I have already told you how studious an imitator he was of that Hortensian way of examining things. I said I could hardly believe it admissible in Greek, that the derivatives of *ν* and *ε* should have no characteristical sign or mark, whereby to distinguish those of the one kind from the other. And I had observed the little force

of the aspi-
dants of
in the on

brings n
" And th
intergato
ing a mu
for us, c
only in on
passed fin
in the kn
3dly, yet
identical
moules:
ample for
fellatio C
thorough
tongue.
rally wri
Southern
phrase:
ral dialect
nary Sou
main of
Spanish
and with
sensible
novelma
sing, at
Gramm
was in c
sense)
then th
other sc
the Pat
ations,
veribus
natio co
as for t
inform
that th
war,
and Va
Rood b
Foliot

of the aspirating, which had been changed not only in $\delta\mu\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota$, $\delta\phi\iota\gamma\sigma\iota$, $\delta\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\sigma$ descendents of $\delta\mu\alpha$, &c. but even in $\nu\delta\sigma$. There remained then that ν should be retained in the one, and varied in the other. The Doctor after an Oration to Laverna.

Sancta Laverna,

Da mihi fallere, da sanctamque phanque videri,

Nobis peccatis, et fraudibus obijce nubem.

brings me in as if I had said simply, the change of ν into μ is hardly admissible in Greek. And then asks, is it possible to be otherwise when ν and π come together? To this foolish interrogatory I answer that neither He, nor I can determine of what is impossible; there being a multitude of circumstances, the knowledge whereof at present is no less impossible for us, then important, for such a decision, viz. the knowledge of the true sound of ν not only in one part but all the Cantons of Greece; and that not for one but all those ages that have passed since the rise of that language, to the declining of that Empire, the ruin whereof brought in the knowledge of the Greek tongue into Europe: yea this is not all, we are to know the $\delta\delta\delta\delta\delta\delta\delta\delta\delta\delta$ of such men as were of repute, for their mistakes or phantasies were authenticated by their followers, and so spread up and down, men endeavouring to sustain their mouths in the pronunciation, as well as pens to the writing of what they had so great an example for. Yea the several $\Gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$ (of which you may read at large in Maussac's dissertation Critica joyned with his notes upon Harpocration's dictionary) ought to be known thoroughly if you mean to determine of what was possible, and what not, in the Greek tongue. I imagin the common dialect in Greece (wherein the books we have are generally written; and which we call Greek) to have been like our ordinary English in the Southern parts: the Attick dialect to have been answerable to our London or rather Court phrase; and the other as well dialects, as $\Gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$, to have corresponded with the several dialects in the North and West of England, and Idioms of other countries. The ordinary Southern language is a mixture of the several dialects used in England (with the remains of those which are otherwise extinct) besides an accessional of Italian, French, Spanish, Welch, &c. according as the inhabitants have conversed one with another, and with foreigners: and even this ordinary language suffers a daily innovation and insensible change, as is evident to the observer, thorough the variation of the ambient, new manner of education, customs, national and personal alliances, Du-Gardismes in Printing, and the assiduation of writers, which new-model us; nor will the Doctors English Grammar be able to stay this imminent alteration. In like manner as the Latin tongue was in continual change, and elegance is nothing but opinion. (I take Latin in a large sense) There was the ordinary Latin received in Rome, Italy, and the Roman colonies: then there was the Roman or more elegant phrase: and besides these two there were other scattered dialects, mixtures of the Tuscan and Oscan, the Greek; &c. there were the Patavinities, Tarentinities, Siculities, Africanities, Hispanities, and as many variations, as regions, (or thus in a more general division; Quadruplex dicendi figura veteribus servata Grammaticis, Prisca, Latina, Romana, miscella.) Hence Tully in his Divinatio contra Verrem, tells Caelius that he learned Latin not at Rome but in Sicily. And as for the common Latin language, it did suffer dayly change: in so much that Polybius informs us, there was so great an alteration in the Latin tongue from what it had been, that the League betwixt the Romans and Carthaginians upon the close of the first Punic war, (which was made in the first year after the ejection of Kings, Junius Brutus and Valerius Poplicola being consuls) could hardly in his time be interpreted or understood by the best Antiquaries: which saying how true it was, may be collected by what Foliota produceth concerning the column erected to Duilius upon his naval victories:

wherein you have no C. but G. as *Lectones, Macistratos*: very seldom. V. as *primus, capion*: then *Exsiccant* for *effugiant*. *Ceset* for *cessit*: the Ablatives singular end in D. as *pradad, alod, merid*: lastly, (besides other archaisms of less note) *Triumpo* for *Triumpbo*, which kind of pronunciation I observed to have continued even in *Tully's* time. The same Author hath a *Gemma* table of a less ancient date, yet of a different stile from what was used in the dayes of *Cicero*. These things considered (if we had no testimony of the difference betwixt the old and the common Greek,) we may conclude the variability of it, which with the consideration of the change it hath undergone since the fall of those Common-wealths makes it certain: (though the multitude of antiquated, and new words, the different pronunciations, changes of the ambient, inroads and conquests of other nations, which might be discoursed on at large,) and consequently no man can determin of what was possible, or impossible in that tongue, but who can give a thorough account of those things, I have named: from which attempt I doubt not but the Doctor is as far from effecting it, though he *brave* it in Criticks, as I am from professing it. The Doctors question therefore was ridiculous, (this is now not only *said*, but proved!) Is it possible to be otherwise, when *v* is to come immediately before *n*? Which question implies a Negation; viz. that it is not possible for *v* to come together, and yet *v* remain unchanged for *μ*. Which proposition I have already demonstrated to be *false*, and I shall now prove it *defalto falso*: and refer my self to the Ancient inscriptions in *Gruterus*, wherein K T N I I A N T O C p. 1010. p. 1037. p. 313. p. 314. p. 315. p. 316. and in several other places, where because they are inscriptions of lesser note, and of more obscure persons, the more ignorant Artisans might have been suspected to have erred, but that these of greater Authority do justify their writing. Doth not *v* go before *n* in *Advort*? Yet you have p. 810. AMENITO *Subito vine incal-pata*: See *finger* upon *Euseb. Chron. writeth colonus arm*: and so doth *Hermannus de liter.* so that you see a very little skill in Greek would have been able to prevent this gross Interogatory: and the persons through whose hands the papers came, are not to be censured, because the Doctors School-learning made him think it a childish business. But I did not say I thought the change of *v* into *μ* hardly admissible in Greek. The Doctor no more quotes my words, then the Devil quoted Scripture to our Saviour; by this way of citation, the whole word of God may become the word of the Devil: like as the *Censura Symboli apostolici ad instar censura Parisiensis* (which is to be found in *Alphonsus de Vargas strateg. Jesuit. and Reynaudus de confir. libror.*) shews each proposition in that Creed to be either Heretical, Dangerous, or Scandalous. My not only but *als.*, is this. It is strange, that *v* should not alter only its aspiration, but change its *v* into *μ*, which [viz. change of both aspiration, and letter: for the change of either in a single consideration, is admissible. I bear with the Doctor for not understanding Greek, you see he is at a loss in plain English.] I can hardly believe admissible in Greek, lest there should be no difference betwixt its derivatives and those of *eo*. And this conjecture of mine (concerning the Grammatical Greek, from whom we received our punctuation and reading) is not very contemptible, if we minde their practice in avoiding confusion. Dr. Wallis upon this consideration, saith it helpeth very little. He durst not say, nothing at all. Though I suppose he will give his words that gloss, which others do to the text in the Gospel, He shall be called the least in the Kingdome of Heaven; that is, He shall never come there. But since the Doctor hath so examined those reasons, upon which I placed "no great stretch: since he hath charged me with being wholly unacquainted with the rudiments of the Greek tongue, (for that I am not able to give a rational account of it, I profess without blushing: *Incerta hac si tu possules ratione certa facere, nihil plus agas, quam si des operam ut cum ratione infamior.*) that my skill is but to turn over *Index's* and *Dictionaries*, (at which work the Doctor was taken tardy; and the latter are good Authors)

those !) I shall sift his reasoning, in which work if I at any time mistake his meanings he must blame himself for speaking so obscurely. As I understand not that query, "Is ν perpetually so changed, when ever any such case should happen, because the Analogy of the Greek tongue will bear it? So it is possible I may misunderstand his next assertion, and yet be far from forgery or falsification. His reason why ν and μ cannot come together without a change, is this. "Because the next letter is a $L A B I$ - "A L : for else there would be no occasion of changing ν into μ in either of them (viz. ν and μ) Would any man talk thus, but who had sat three years in the Synod? Can he that decyphers characters, thus puzzle his reader in plain English?

1. Propof. When a Labial follows ν , there is OCCASION for to change it into μ .
2. Propof. Otherwise there is no OCCASION.

Would any man of common sense (but I have to do with a Professor!) talk thus, where the Question is, Whether the Greek Pedants would take or omit the OCCASION? Did I deny there was Occasion? Did not I only think, they would neglect the Occasion, and dispense with a facility of pronunciation, (if it were so) where different senses might more trouble the readers brain, then the word would his tongue.

Otherwise there is no Occasion! what then? Did they alwayes take the benefit of proffered Occasions? Did they never vary when there was none? Trye your Hearfel Doctor (for I know you make your own phantasie, and that pronunciation to which you have been accustomed, the rule of Euphony and Cacophony) and see whether ν and μ , ν and μ , do not sound as ill as ν and μ ; I think they sound worse: I know very well that as people have been differently educated, so they vary in their sentiments. Aldus Manutius differs from me about what is Euphonus, and what Cacophonous: he says *Quidquid*. I think *quidquid* sounds best, &c. Diverse men have diverse opinions concerning a *file*; *Bambus* and *Barclay*, *Milton* (that glory of our English nation) and *Salmasius* make use of a different sort of writing: yet who doubts but each did acquiesce in his own way as best? When the Doctor speaks Greek (and in writing $\epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ or $\epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, may as well stand as $\epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ or $\epsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$) the word is only Greek, the sound is English: and so for Latin. That the way of writing is not to be regarded, nor upon that any great argument to be built, I think I may well conclude, and that because that the letters may be the same in several nations, yet the sounds different; and the impossibility of one following another lies upon the tongue of the speaker, not the hand of the writer. I shall illustrate this, from what *Gibbonius* layes down in his preface to *Lucretius*, upon another occasion. *Qui contra libros veteres multis locis nihil et nihilum in nil et nilum, ratione, ut ipsi putant, versum ac numerorum, commutant: na illi in veterum Scriptis versantur, nec attendunt Synactesim veteres in metiendo dantaxat multis locis observasse, in scribendo arissime. Hinc multa in Plauto, Terentio, aliisque antiquis mutationes mala.* The same I say concerning writing, and speaking; but even in writing betwixt ν and μ both according to the old capital, and later small letter, there was a great affinity in configuration: (which may topically infer an affinity in sound) as any man knows that hath seen an old print in Greek, or antient Marble. And if I did not speak of Labials and Palatines, it was because I had not to do with Hebrew or Welch, &c. but Greek. And how doth he know what modulations they had of their voice, and what sound they gave to their letters? It is clear that they had a different sound for their vowels, then we have: *Cheek* and *Smith* were more able to disprove their old pronunciation, then confirm that which they introduced, not as genuine, but convenient. I shall not speak of all the letters of the Greek Alphabet, because it would be a long and perhaps tedious work: I shall only now shew that:

copy of Tully, he cites *in memoriam*, &c. for *in memoriam*, &c. from all which I think I may infer that though the Greeks had 16, or 24. letters (that matters not at present) they had more sounds, than letters: and [in *Smyrna* and *Delos*] in particular, that ν had a different sound according as the letter following (whether in the same, or another word, so it were contained within the same clause, and to be pronounced in the same breath) was different.

Secondly, that where the words were not pronounced in the same breath, but interrupted by an *imaginary* comma, or the like, (for *real* stops and pauses they had none) that then the *sound* and *letter* were not varied, as appears every where in the *mariora Arundiniana*, and especially in the two last examples rehearsed, where you have $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\chi\phi\epsilon\theta\omega\gamma$, &c. and $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\chi\phi\epsilon\theta\omega\gamma$. TETENH MEN ONMHTE, &c. and TPOHOMMHΘENA, &c. And in the latter after *METETEY* follows, $\chi\phi\epsilon\theta\omega\gamma$. METETETINXPHCΘΩCAN, and if that change be not always observed, I suppose it may have happened, because that since neither μ or ν did express the sound, it might indifferently be written either way as participating of the sound of both, but rather μ than ν .

Thirdly, I infer, that the reason did not concern only *composition*, but extended to *simplex*: and the reason why ν was not written before π , &c. in *composition*, was, because it could not be written or pronounced before π , &c. in the *simplex*; for ν in the same clause coming before π did not sound full, as it did before τ or σ , but had a middle sound betwixt μ and ν ; and therefore if the Doctor meant that it was impossible for ν to come before π and retain its full English sound, I do grant it: but so it could not come before $\mu\sigma\iota\gamma$ as well as $\mu\sigma\iota\gamma$, so that he should have said $\mu\epsilon\mu\sigma\iota\gamma$ no less than $\mu\epsilon\mu\sigma\iota\gamma$.

Fourthly I infer, that ν might be written before π either in *simplex* or *compound* (there being the same reason, if they were within the same clause) though not altogether so well as μ , (because the sound was more like that of μ than ν) since that the Greeks had no Character whereby to express those *mixed* sounds upon the concurrence of consonants. In which point also the Latins were to seek: as you may read in *Vossius de arte Grammatica* l. 1. c. 20. Where he cites a passage out of *Marius Valerinus* (whom he thus characterizes, *Scriptor accuratus et antiquus; ut quem cum Donato, Hieronymi Magistro, vixisse velex Eusebio constare possit*.) The beginning whereof doth confirm, and is confirmed by what I have said. *Clavi in studiis viri, qui aliquid de Orthographia scripsere, OMNES ferè dant; inter M, et N, literas, MEDIAM VOCEM, qua non abbotter ab utraque litera, sed neutram PROPRIE exprimat, tam nobis [Latinis] deesse, quàm Græcis: cum illi Sambyx [forte συμβύχην, vel ἀμπύχην, aut χουαμπύχην] scribant, nec M exprimere, nec N. Sed hæc ambiguitas in his fortasse vocabulis, sicut in Ampelo, Lycambe; (and why not in $\mu\epsilon\mu\sigma\iota\gamma$?) in nostris non est, &c.*

Although I think I have said enough to refute the Doctor's assertion, yet I shall further consider what the Doctor hath said by way of reason: "That ν before a *Labial* had occasion to be changed into μ . In his *Grammatico-physical* discourse he tells us these are Labials. P. F. B. V. W. M. I would fain know whether he mean that when ever N. comes before any of these in any language it be impossible but that it be changed into M. I gave some account of the ancient orthography out of *Hesychius*, who affords a multitude of the like stamp, amongst which there are exceptions against this reason as $\sigma\mu\mu\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\gamma$. It is the same Author that hath $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\chi\phi\epsilon\theta\omega\gamma$, for $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \rho\omicron\varsigma$: and $\epsilon\gamma\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\epsilon\sigma\iota\delta\iota\varsigma$. Gruter in his marbles hath CTNBIO p. 87. and p. 791. and which is more TTNBOG for $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\chi\phi\epsilon\theta\omega\gamma$ several times, but amongst the inscriptions of mean persons. A Cretan marble hath ENBAAEN for $\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\gamma$ p. 305. Another inscription of note hath CTNBANTAC $\chi\alpha\delta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ for $\sigma\mu\beta\alpha\delta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. The other *Labials* need

no instances; and what is said for N before B will make a probability as to P. Since there hath been of old so great an affinity betwixt those two letters in sound, that the one is often put for the other, and when the one is written the other is sounded. Hence in the Latin, *asper, aspers, &c.* for *obser, abser*. Quintilian l. 1. c. 7. *Quasi sole in scribendo prepositiones, sonum, quem iunctura efficiunt, an quem separata, observare conveni- at: ut cum dico obstruunt. Secundum enim B litteram ratio poscit: aures magis audiunt P.* So Vossius (to whom I owe that citation) saith, *Arabs, trabs, urbs, quia sic inter du- cissimos obtinuit, per B scribo: sed sonus exiguitur, trapt, Arapt.* This concurrence of consonants gave occasion to mix sounds, and thereupon men came to write promiscu- ously some that *juxta sonum vocis separata*, and others *juxta sonum quem iunctura efficiat*. But I have made trial in English of N before B; and unless the Doctors whistle differ from my windpipe, I can pronounce *Henbane*: I say pronounce it, for I can spell it *Hen- bane*: nor do I finde any physical impossibility in the founding of *Hemphse*, or *Emphse*. However, the Doctor should not have reminded us of the *Labial w*. But being to give his reason, why *v* before *w* is changed into *u*, he should only have said, *because it comes before v*. But how *v* might have come before *w* I have shown: and he must be a great stranger to the rise of languages, that thinks it not only impossible, but improbable that the case was otherwise, but since N and P are by the Doctor allowed the same sound with *v* and *w*, that which renders the case of one impossible, must have the like influence upon the other. Yet I finde that the ancients wrote *Inopinto*, in an old inscription at *Naples*, the same Authority there is for *Quod, iri, improbari, inprobium esto*, and else- where *inpedinus*. So *Faernus* upon *Terence* helps me with *Inquæ, Inprudens, Inperiosus* was wrote upon the Roman arch triumphal: and *inperium* in *Sigomius's* brags table. In the *Pandetti* at Florence, there are, *Inpube, Inpresum, Inperfedum, Inpossibile*. *Pruden- tianus* hath this verse.

Imititis, aures, asper, implacabilis,

And an infinity of the like might be cited out of *Dansiquin* about the old Latin tongue, and others. But lest these should be the writings of *agreste Latium* only, when men wanted our Geometrical *phoneticus*, the Italians have either retained or resumed that pro- nunciation. *Florio* furnishes me with store of examples, *Importare, Inpresa, Inpendere, Inpertinens, &c.* which are not to be confuted in this case by *della Crusca*. I have now taken away that physical impossibility of the concurrence of *v* and *w*, N and P: of which what are we that we should determin? Who neither know the sound of the letters, nor the several conformations of parts which regulate that ayre (which also is different here and there) the phantasm of the motion whereof continued to our ear is Sound! I now aver that not *Euphony* but *use* was regarded in the generation of language: time be- gets that alteration, which if we call *polishing* or *perfecting*, we must build upon the opi- nions of men: what is *Euphonus* to one is *Cacophonous* to another: and what pronun- ciation is difficult or impossible to one, is not so to another. We see when different nations speak Latin, they give it the found of their own countries, and retain nothing of the old Roman but the letters and words when written. Thus *Aldus* thinks one thing Euphonus, and I another; he being an Italian diversly educated, and I an English- man. There was a time when *Tonfriz, Cursfriz, Fesfriz*, sounded well; *Charisius* the Grammarian (as I am informed) saith they ought to be written so. *Sollempius, Somp- ius, Hieimp*, were once very taking. The like may be said of the Greek, of which the Latin is a descendant; I told you before of *Ξανθός*, &c. there was a time when they were not only usually so pronounced, but it was reputed elegant. *Phrynichus* in his *Ecloga diction Atticar*. *Ξανθός ὁ ἑστῆς ὁ ἐρρεῖται ἀπασπόμενος τῶα, Ξανθός ὁ ἑστῆς*

...
...
I think I
rise and de
vented.
one nation
not found
get no dif
found per
quent in G
have acco
nounce B
famous G
vo, and j
but on th
charitable
vine! is,
lost as to
boyes, or

But th
mology:
sure beg

Br. W.
"him wi
"the cha
"upon i
"natives
"the for
"the fir
"analog
"in v
"tion at
"where
"not
"w
"w
"w
"that
"take i
"sua v
"not p
"long

What
what st

ἐξαινεῖς ἡ ἀπαύειν. He says you must leave out α. Nennsius in his notes reads it ἐξαινεῖν. Etymology. Ἐξάλλειν, ἐξάγει. Ἀπαινεῖν αὖ ἐξάλλειν ἢ ἐξάγει ἀπαύειν. Ὅστις ἂν πλεονάζῃ ἐφοκλήσῃ ἐξαινεῖν. ἢ ἔσθ' Πάτριον τὸ Κομικὸν ἐξαινεῖν. But I think I have detained you too long with this discourse, which a little knowledge in the rise and declination of languages, and the Grammatico-physical part thereof, might have prevented. The same letters have different sounds in divers nations, and the Euphony of one nation doth not give laws to another. Terentianus Maurus tells us that Cn. doth not sound well: but C there must sound like G, yet in Greek κνίξας, κνίμυς, &c. beget no disorder: non quod dissimilis res, sed quod is qui dicit. Let an English man try to sound μw in the beginning of a word (as the Latines cared not for Mn. which is frequent in Greek) he will hardly pronounce it; viz. Μπαλίζης: but when he shall have accommodated those letters to the modern Turco-greek sound, he will as easily pronounce Βαλίζης or Παμλίζης as Βαζαζέτ. The like for Ντ, as Ντίζα for Doris the famous Genouche. Be pleased once more to read over the discourse of our Critical Bravo, and judge what ground he had to cast that scorn and contempt not upon me only, but on the Gentleman thorough whose hands my letter passed to Mr. Hobs. The most charitable opinion I can have of the Doctor, and if such charity may extend to a Divine! is, that he engaged into this *rant* merely to save his reputation, which being lost as to all persons of learning, he determined to fit down with the applause of School-boys, or such as deserve no better esteem.

But the Doctor upon second thoughts, will assist me with arguments against his Etymology: I shall consider his reasons, and give you an account of them; they must sure be good, for his charge against mine, obliges him to nothing trivial.

Br. W. But if he have a minde to dispute against the Etymology, I could furnish him with better arguments by much, then that of changing ν into μ. For (besides the change of the spirer, which I allow to be considerable, though he put less weight upon it) the termination of πωα doth not regularly descend from πύς, all its derivatives retaining either the termination us, or, so soon as they depart from it, assume the form of the oblique cases πωδ. (as άπύς, άπώδθ, πωδίζω, &c.) And further the first part of the Composition, if it were εν could not regularly, according to the analogy of other compounds, end in a Consonant but in a Vowel; not as έμύς, nor ένπύς, but ένπύς. And moreover, the word εν doth not usually begin a Composition at all. Nor do I at present remember any one word in the whole Greek tongue, where εν is the first part of the composition: but instead of ές, they use μωθ [not ενθόδωμωδς, but μωθόδωμωθ unocular.] And so it should not have been έμπύς, nor έμπύωα, nor ένπύωα, nor yet ένπύς, to express that notion, but rather μωρόπύς, in the same form with μωρόδωδς; or μωροκαλός, in the same form with δωροκαλός, which is Empusa's Epithite. And these arguments would prove indeed that έμπύωα is no regular grammatical composition, (nor do any that mention it, take it to be so;) but that it may not pass amongst the catalogue of remotiora compositiona vel derivata [of which we finde in Etymologists a competent number] or may not pass for as good a jumble as εν πωνύ βαλνυα, I see no reason; nor, why that of so long standing, and allowed by so good Authors, should give place to this upstart.

What value is to be put upon the change of spirer I have already declared; as also what stress may be laid upon the variation of ν into μ in this case: and though I have

invalidated those arguments in a single consideration, yet the change of both in the same word seems to me still a little improbable. But he tells me further that the termination "on *trous* doth not regularly descend from *τρῆς*. I would he had determined what he meant by regularly: for those rules of Grammar we have (I do not mean Camden's Grammar) are of a later date than is *ἐμπροσθεν*, and therefore it cannot be counted irregular *ex post-facto*. Nor, if all the other compounds or derivatives have a different termination, will any wise man thereupon infer that there cannot be a singularity in this? As for that which he further objects: "if the first part of the composition were *ἐν*, it could not regularly according to the Analogy of other compounds, end in a consonant, but in a vowel: I would he had cleared up his thoughts, and told us in what country it was so irregular, and what Analogy of compounds he would oppose us with. I for my part find in the *Etymologicum magnum*, that the Atticks in the compounds and descendants from numerals did retain their last letter; that is, they did assume nothing after it; *ἐξῆς* not *ἐξῆδες*, *δυσῆς* not *δυσῆδες*: these men then (and they a considerable part of Greece, and from whom especially did descend that common dialect of ours) would have said *ἐνῆς*, and *ἐνῆου*, not *ἐνῆως*. The assertion is to be found in the said book in *ἐξῆδυσον*. And for the compounds of *ἐν*, the Doctor could not think to over-rule us with their Analogy whereas he knew of none, for *ἐνῆς* is no Greek word, no more then *δυσῆς* offend, of which it is said *δυσῆς quasi δυσῆως*: *δυσῆς quasi δυσῆως*: *ἐνῆς quasi ἐνῆως*. That which he further suggests, "how *ἐν* doth not usually begin a composition at all, is very weak arguing, and I shall not make use of it until the Doctor legitimize that other argument, that because most men are unlearned, therefore none are learned. The compounds of *νέπος* do not usually assume *ἐν*: may not we therefore say *δυσῆδες*, *ἐν τῷ ἰσχυρῷ νέπος*, *πλεονακτὴν τῷ δ*? A very little skill in Greek would have been able to rectify such an argument: as also to inform his memory better, then to forget that in the whole Greek tongue (and that is a thing of large extent) there should not be one word, where *ἐν* is the first part of the composition: what not *ἐν δέκα*? Have you so soon forgot your numbers? *ἐν δέκα*, *ἀνάλειψ* annulus, *ἐνῆος*, *navis uniremis*, (*ἐνῆος*) *ἐνῆος*, *ἐνῆος*, and *ἐνῆος* *qua una hora digna sunt*, besides *παντα* & *universa* five *universis*, which where I have read I do not remember; but I think it is in *Heraldis* upon *Arnobius*. You see Doctor how a mans memory may fail him; but you seem to decay in your judgement also, when you infer, that "Because you remember no compound beginning with *ἐν*, therefore it should not have been *ἐνῆος*, nor *ἐνῆου*, nor yet *ἐνῆς*, but *ἐνῆος*, or *μυνοκαλῆς*: as I have evinced unto you. It remains now only to consider your conclusion, wherein you say, that your derivation is allowed (as in another place you say it is received Etymology) by so good Authors: the contrary whereof I have made appear in the letter as it is now augmented: where I have shewed you reason why your old groundless deduction should give way to this upstart. Upstart! doth the Doctor think this an objection? Doth he reject things because new, and not because false? I wonder a Theologian should argue thus. I might as well condemn his writings because he is a lesser man than I. However the Doctor should consider that second thoughts are best, and that a child upon a *Giant's* shoulder (it is a saying of the reformed Divines; and the Doctor called me *Sawney* boy, though I do not think I stand upon a *Giant's* shoulders when I overlook him) may see further then the *Giant*. I do not know whether the Doctor think that I intended to jumble *ἐν* *νὸς* *βαλῶν* into one word: if he did, he mistakes me as much as he did them he said did deduce *οὐκ ἔστιν* from *οὐκ ἔστιν* *οὐκ ἔστιν*: for though they said so, they gave you the derivation in *fact* only, and not in *truth*.

All

All that I
the Gree
Green-a.
only rec
and *οὐκ*
one letter
further st
such an
h. 6.

Here is
ception
Erymole
&c. I hav
variae)
might cr
trus and
of admir

The
disputed
pede inc
cited at
boy in th
was call
which re
did him
νὸς κα
δὴναδ
de ingre
told: a
refer to
but the
tributed
de. S

Dr. W
"aere li
"nor ar
"when
"profes
"in hig
"Engli

All that I insist upon is that it come from *ἔμψυς*: concerning the termination, perhaps the Greeks may have had a way in old times of adding *α*, as we in English do *A. as Green-a*. perhaps it is only *α* Feminine: It may come from *ἐν ποσσὶν ἔσα*, the *π* being only retained: nor is that deduction by such an *apocope*, worse then *μῶνυξ* from *μῆν* & *ὄνυξ*, *μῶνυξ*. I am not the first that observe in Etymologies the retaining of one letter is sufficient: as *Nepiunus à nando*, which is laughed at by *Tully*. Yet I can further shew of later date then those antiquated times when *Empusa* had its original, such an *Apocope*, as is more then *littera vel syllaba ablatis*. In the Greek Epigrams l. 6.

Τὸν δῶ, καὶ τὰς κνή, τὴν δ' ἀπὸ δου καὶ δόρυ καὶ κελ

Γοργόδοσι λῆλει ἀνδρὶ Τιμωδίν.

Here is for *δῶ*, *δῶ*; for *κνήμης*, *κνή*; for *κελόν* & *κελ*; and which is an exception to your Grammar, they do not varie their gender and become *newters*. If this Etymology displease, deduce it from *ἔμψυς* and *αὐ* for *δου*, *Laconic*, as *ζα* for *διδ*, &c. I have read such use of *αὐ*, but I remember not where. *Σα* (so *Hesych*; but *αὐ* *Favosine*) signifies also *αὐ*, safe: so that the person affrighted at the sight of a *speetre*, might cry to his companions, "*ἔμψυς, αὐ*": here is an *ἔμψυς*, is all well? Or from *ἔμψυς* and *αὐ*, which is *dolentis interjectio*: or from *ἔμψυς* and *αὐ*, which is an interjection of admiration.

The next passage of the Doctors is a very considerable one; whether what we have disputed of be only a *οὐκαταμαρτυρία*, whether *Mr. Hobbs* did well to English the Doctors *uno pede incedere by hopping*? I think he, or any one else that reads the passage which I have cited at large before, will think the Doctor intended it so: for though he said that the boy in the play did *uno pede incedere*, which is not denied: yet he also said, that that play was called *Empusa* (or *Ludus Empusa*) because that that *Empusa* did *uno pede incedere*: which reason will be well, if the terms *uno pede incedere* be equivocal. *Mr. Hobbs* then did him no wrong in Englishing it so; no more then I, who cannot understand that *ἐνὶ ποσσὶ καὶ χεῖρσιν* in the context of *Aristophanes* scholiast should signifie to *hop*: or *ἐνὶ ποσσὶ δίνχα* as the words lie in *Eustathius*, (*ἐνὶ ποσσὶ* *δίνχα*, is not his quotation, nor *uno pede ingrediens* in *Junius*;) what the meaning of those places may be, I have already told: and the Doctor doth not bring any thing to the contrary. *Rhodiginus* doth but refer to *Eustathius*, and if he hath ill translated him, am I accountable for his errors? but the mistake was on the Doctors side, for *Rhodiginus* used a term that might be attributed to the gate of the Gods, as well as the footing of men. *Et vera incessu patuit dea*. *Superum incedo regina*: but the Doctor restrained it to *hopping* as I have shewed.

Dr. W. But how I should wrong *Junius*, in taking these words of his, *altero pede in aere librato, uno subsiliunt pede*, to be understood of *hopping*, I do not understand, nor am likely to do all he can finde out a possible meaning of those words. And when he hath so done, I will see what I can pick out of *his Dutch*. For though I do not profess my self a Dutch man, yet so much Dutch I have as to understand that *Hincken* in high-Dutch, and *Op een been springen*, in low-Dutch signifie the same as to *hop* in English.

Thus the Doctor changeth the controversie: "I said he had grossly wronged *Junius*, and imposed upon his readers, if he did not finde in the Dutch (for the Latin hath no such thing) that *Ludus Empusæ* was the boyes play of fox to thy holt. I gave an account of *Junius*'s words, which I desire may be read over again: that both the Latin and Dutch did signifie to hop I know; but whether they signified the play of fox to thy holt, that I knew not, and desired a better expositor then the German I asked. That which *Junius* saith will agree to *Ascoliasmus*, or any play that consists in hopping: and consequently what *Junius* said doth no more make for fox to thy holt, then Scotch hop. I would say more to this paragraph, but that I do not understand well what it is the Doctor requires of me, when he expects that I finde out a possible meaning for those words of *Junius*. Either he or the printer are in a fault here; or did not the printer print it thus, because he had so written it?

His *Parenthesis* ought not here to be left out: "He doth not know well how a man can go upon one leg without hopping. The question is concerning the gate of the *Dæmons*, and he talks how men go: just as if I should argue, (as I do not, but the Doctor) I do not know well how men can see without eyes, Ergo God sees with eyes. I do not know how *Pythagoras* went: and yet he is reported to have had *Χρυσὴν ἀλῆα*. I understand not what kinde of motion the *Assolistic* pillar, or that of *Thrasylabus* had, (of which I cited *Clemaus Alexan.*) the motion of that will sure with that of one leg, yet I do not think it hopped. In fables and phantasies I do not use to exact scrutiny, lest I should finde them as ridiculous that excellent piece of *reglery* and merriment the *Extravagant shepherd* doth represent them. I do not understand how *Talus* the iron-man (not only in the *ferry Queen*, but *Apollonius Rhodius* and *Plato*) did move his limbs: yet I shall not say he went as we do, because I do not know well how a man can go otherwise then by setting one foot before the other. *Apollon. Argon.* l. 4.

————— Τάλας Χαλκίαις —————

Τὸν μὲν Χαλκίαις μελεμεύων ἀνθρώπων

ῥιζὺς λοιπὸν ἴδεντα, μετ' ἀνδράσιν ἡμιθέουσιν

Εὐρώπῃ Κερνίδας νῆσους περὶν ἔμμεναι βέρον,

Τεῖς σφδ' Χαλκίαις κρήνην ποτὶ διένεοντα.

Ἀλλ' ἦτοι τὸ μὲν ἄλλο δέμας καὶ γούνα τέλειτο

Χαλκίαις δὲ ἄρρηκτο, ὑπαὶ δ' οἱ ἴσχε τέλειτο

Σύειν δ' ἀμαπύσανα καὶ σφυρὸν αὐτὰς ὀπῆγα

ἀπὸ τοῦ μὲν ἔφης ἔχε πύργον καὶ θανάτοιο.

It may be the manner of his motion is implied in *drusus*, but if the Doctor should deny it, I could not prove it to him. Many of the like instances might be given: and if I had not been taught, I should as little have known how the Gods did move: which is excellently described by *Ronsard* in his poem upon *Q. Margaret*.

Thus he describes *Pasithea* one of *Venus's* Graces coming from Heaven,

* *

‘ *The young and all Divine Pasithea*

‘ *The Skyes abandon’d her command t’ obey,*

‘ *The ayre gave place unto her, and the winde*

‘ *Thorough the vast regions blow’d her up behinde.*

* *

‘ *She stoop’d descending in a suddain flight,*

‘ *Cleaving the clouds, as in the silent night*

‘ *Far off there in a shining track is spi’d*

‘ *A falling star betwixt two ayres to glide.*

And afterwards he describes the Queens dancing at the Ballet Royall.

* *

‘ *Locking his hand in her’s the King did lead*

‘ *The dance, and her who did not seem to tread,*

‘ *But*

' But as she had no feet, she in her pace

' Swimm'd as she mov'd with a celestial grace.

* *

' Man heavy treads, and by his gate doth slow

' The dull allyance he to earth does owe :

' But Gods do flie, and unconfin'd to pace

' Prove their eternal and spiritual race.

* *

' when the Lavalto was of Provence danc'd,

' The King with this his sister Grace advanc'd

' In a grave sweetness, nimble following She

' with ayrie motion 'bout the Hall did flee.

What remains of this discourse is taken up in a mistake of mine, which being neither voluntary, nor greatly material, I am the less concerned in acknowledging that I did him wrong imposing upon him that he should say *Empusa* came to be attributed to the *boyes* play. He said *comes* to be attributed, &c. As I have represented it now in the text, which my haste did not then permit me to consider so thoroughly. I acknowledged that the *boyes*' play might be so called, but that it was so called I desired prooffe. I excepted against *Holyoke* and *Thomas* (for *Junius* hath no such thing : and the two dictionaries aforesaid deceived the Doctor, for they said *Ascoliasmus Ludus Empusa Jun. fox to thy hole* : and he presently thought *Junius* had said *Ludus Empusa* was the same game with *fox to thy hole*.) I excepted against them as no *Authors*, but *vocabularies*. I confess they may in some sense be called *Authors*, as the Doctor may be called the *Author* of that Phrase *adducis malleum*, which term will not make for his advantage, when any

any man shall bestow it upon him: I took it in that sense which *Lancelotus Pafius* (to whom I had then regard) did take it in, when he disputes whether *Isidorus*, *Priscian*, &c. be to be acknowledged *Authors*? Lib. 2. c. 34. *Autbores voco et vocandos cenſeo, quorum diſſa ſequamur ad inſtituendam eruditionem*; and afterwards, *Autbores propriè Scripſiores, ut Homerus, accipiendi, qui fuerunt ante obſervationem artiſ Grammatica, quorum diſſa obſervare poſteriores aliqui ad artem ſermonis, et hoc pertinet ad Grammaticos: aliqui æmulati ſunt, ut poete, atque alii, unde & ipſi authorum nomine gaudent. Ego cum dicunt aliqui Authorem Prifcianum, (ne alios hoc genus recenſeam) animadvertant, an ab eo ſit Authoritas quem ſequatur eruditorum conſenſus, qui in ipſa Grammatica nititur aliorum exemplis: qua cauſa eſt, quod ubi caret exemplo iterum atque iterum explodiur; Præcipue à Vallâ taxatur Nonius, non dicam de Servio & Dorato quos conſtat authoritate muniri poetarum, oratorum, hiſtoricorum. Quid? quod Plinius in Grammaticæ, Charifius, Probus, Diomedes, & majoris exiſtimationis Gellius, citant Scripſiores: nulla alia profeſſo de cauſa, niſi ut dignoſcantur miniſtri à dominis; ii ſunt Grammatici, hi verò autbores.* Which words ſince they are highly rational, I ſee no cauſe why I ſhould recede from my former thoughts: doth any man take the ſingle Authority of *Thomas*, or *Holyoke*, for a ſufficient prooſe in Latin. It ſeems the Doctör doth; I adviſe him therefore betimes to ſue out a writ of *Priviledge*, and remove his caſe from *Weſtminſter School* to the *Univerſity*, for there it is ſo far from being valued, that it is a *whipping matter* for any in the upper forms to alledge them. You ſee what a difference there is betwixt *Claffique* and *Claffical* Authors. He aſks me what is the difference betwixt *Ὀνομαſτικόν* and *Vocabularium*? This is not ſo perplexing a Query, as the Doctör took it to be. There is no difference in the name; but there is a great difference in our manner of citing them: I cite *Pollux* as a *Vocabulary*, he refers to *Thomas* and *Holyoke* as *Authors*. He would not cite *Pollux*, becauſe he did not think him to be a prophet: yet I favourably think the Doctör did prophetically bring againſt Mr. *Hobs* that argument *ad hominem*. Whether the Authors I have cited all along be to the purpoſe, I refer to the diſcreet readers judgement: I doubt not but he will concur with me in this, that the Doctör hath felt the force of them to the purpoſe: and particularly as to *Aſcoliaſmus* I could not but ſpeak of it, for without deſing ſo I could neither have found *Ludus Empuſæ* in *Junius*, nor fox to thy hole in *Rider*. or *Thomas*.

with Books. That I have in all the effort and energy
and I feel it to be my duty to do so in the way to which
as in the promotion of Books and the cause of Do-
mestic Ministry I have laid in an account of Do-
mestic Ministry to a Member of the Army in Scotland, which
I have long since catalogued, and put in Latin, but could
not find it in his list, but I have a copy; some have
thought that the work might give a great deal to the de-
votion, but they say it is a work which is not to be de-
voted to only hands, and nothing recommended to the times;
which is the customary procedure of those that intend to
write, not to be. But I have been reading it, and
reading it, and in this work, I may well expect
the success of the Book in Oxford, (which I have placed in my
list both for the purpose of dividing what I have mediated in order
to the cause: wherein I do promise myself such an answer to
the work, as I have seen in the only man who places in the
Compendium, that they shall never be produced again com-
piled. This great work has not been so long delayed, but
that it was long delayed, (which I will explain)
and that are my language upon the reading Dr. W. would per-
mit me the use of a Pen: And I have then written to you my
difficulties, then to you, and I thought I might take a greater
time to prepare for myself, then had been otherwise necessary
to the dispute. Nor do I now go about to winnow over the
single Doctor, (the compendium is too mean), but over all those
whole interests of literature may have been the cause of
average, who are interested at least; and that the voice of
the people will have them speaking too, I have thought them
worthy the passion of

Thy Obedient Friend
and Servant

Oxford June 17.
1757.

Henry Stubble

Sect. 7.

Now come to the Doctors last and greatest triumph, at which I cannot but stand in admiration, when I consider he hath not got the victory. Had the Doctor been pleased to have conversed with some of the Fifth Form in Westminster School (for he needed not to have troubled the Learned Master) he might have been better informed then to have exposed himself thus.

Mr. Hobbes had said, A Mark, or of some put instead of it, *scripsi*, which is a mark with an hot Iron, is visible; if visible, then it hath quantity; and consequently may be divided into parts innumerable. After that the Doctor had reflected upon the wit of the argument (whereas he ought to have replied to the Antecedent: the reason being valid. It is visible, therefore 'tis divisible) He is pleased to play the Drol thus upon that saying, *scripsi* is a mark without an hot Iron. 'Prethee tell me good Tho. before we leave this point (O the wit of a Divinity Doctor!) who it was told thee that *scripsi* was a mark with an hot Iron? for 'tis a notion I never heard till now, (and do not believe it yet) Never believe him that told thee that lye; for as sure as can be, he did it to abuse thee. *scripsi* signifies a distinctive point in writing made with a Pen or Quill, not a mark made with an hot Iron, such as they brand Rogues withal; and accordingly *scribo*, *describo*, *distingo*, *interfingo*, are often so used. It is also used of a Mathematical point, or somewhat else that is very small, *scripsi* X^o *moment*, or the like. What should come in your Cap, to make you think that *scripsi* signifies a mark or brand with an hot Iron? I perceive where the business lies; 'twas *scripsi* ran in your mind when you talked of *scripsi*, and because the words are somewhat alike, you jumbled them both together, according to your usual care and accurateness, as if they had been the same.

Dr. V.

When I read this, I cannot but be astonished at the Doctors confidence, and applaud him who said, *quidam Jures & philosophi*. That the Doctor should never hear that *scripsi* signifies a mark with an hot iron, is a manifest argument of his ignorance: But that he should advise Mr. Hobbes not to believe his own readings, or any mans else that should tell him it did signifie any such thing, is a piece of notorious impudence. That *scripsi* signifies a distinctive point in writing made with a Pen or Quill, (is a Pen one thing, and a Quill another to write with?) nobody denies. But it must be withal acknowledged that it signifies many things else. I know the Doctor is a good Historian (else he should not presume to object the want of History to another) let him tell us how long agoe it is, since men have made use of Pens or Quills in writing; for if that invention be of no long standing, this signification must also be such; and so it could not be that from any allusion thereunto the Mathematicians used it for a point. Another thing I would fain know of this great Historian; how long agoe *scripsi* and *scribo* began to signifie *interpagos*? for if the Mathematicks were studied before the mystery of Painting was found out (as shall be proved, when ever it shall please the Doctor out of his no-reading to maintaine the contrary.) Then the Mathematical use thereof should have been named before the Grammatical. And if this word be translative, and that Sciences were the effect of long contemplation, the names used herein are borrowed from common talk; Mr. Hobbes did well to say that *scripsi* preceeded *scribo*, so that indivisible signification, which it afterwards had, did signifie a visible mark, made by an hot Iron, or the like. And in this procedure, he did no more then any

not what the Doctor can reply; it being possible, & with what the same Author saith in the life of *Protagoras*, that *Protagoras* could speak as well as *Protagoras*, whom *Protagoras* calls *Protagoras*. If the Doctor object that he is a *Modern* Author, he will never be able to render him so inconsiderable as *Adriani Junii Nomenclator*, *Thomae* and *Rider*. If any will deny that he writes good Greek, *Mitronimus* *Wegius* will tell them, his only fault is *metastasis*, redundancy in words, and not the use of bad ones.

Besides, it is the judgement of a great Master of the Greek tongue, that *Stipsum*, *non tam parva res, quam multis varietatibus superfluum* *Græcæ vocaturum*. I need not I suppose name him, so great a Critic as the Doctor cannot be ignorant of him.

Against this all that the Doctor saith is either false or grounded upon such mistakes, as that ungenerous resolution of his never to acknowledge, makes me suspect for voluntary. What Mr. *Hobbes*'s argument was you have seen in the Letter, where he cannot except against the state of the question, it being taken out of himself *discreet*. P. 28. "All that Mr. *Hobbes* said, was that *for equities sunt de falsitate crymæ*, which is a mark with an *hot iron*. I did so understand this saying of his as if he had denoted those words with an *hot iron*, to explain, not to determine and restrain the signification of *crymæ*. Which favour I allow the Doctor when he saith *crymæ* (not *crymæ*) is a mark with an *hot iron*. For *crymæ* is not only any sort of mark, as upon the Dragons in *Hesiod* afore-cited, and *Isidorus* *de etymologia* *lib. 1. c. 1. c. 2. c. 3. c. 4. c. 5. c. 6. c. 7. c. 8. c. 9. c. 10. c. 11. c. 12. c. 13. c. 14. c. 15. c. 16. c. 17. c. 18. c. 19. c. 20. c. 21. c. 22. c. 23. c. 24. c. 25. c. 26. c. 27. c. 28. c. 29. c. 30. c. 31. c. 32. c. 33. c. 34. c. 35. c. 36. c. 37. c. 38. c. 39. c. 40. c. 41. c. 42. c. 43. c. 44. c. 45. c. 46. c. 47. c. 48. c. 49. c. 50. c. 51. c. 52. c. 53. c. 54. c. 55. c. 56. c. 57. c. 58. c. 59. c. 60. c. 61. c. 62. c. 63. c. 64. c. 65. c. 66. c. 67. c. 68. c. 69. c. 70. c. 71. c. 72. c. 73. c. 74. c. 75. c. 76. c. 77. c. 78. c. 79. c. 80. c. 81. c. 82. c. 83. c. 84. c. 85. c. 86. c. 87. c. 88. c. 89. c. 90. c. 91. c. 92. c. 93. c. 94. c. 95. c. 96. c. 97. c. 98. c. 99. c. 100. c. 101. c. 102. c. 103. c. 104. c. 105. c. 106. c. 107. c. 108. c. 109. c. 110. c. 111. c. 112. c. 113. c. 114. c. 115. c. 116. c. 117. c. 118. c. 119. c. 120. c. 121. c. 122. c. 123. c. 124. c. 125. c. 126. c. 127. c. 128. c. 129. c. 130. c. 131. c. 132. c. 133. c. 134. c. 135. c. 136. c. 137. c. 138. c. 139. c. 140. c. 141. c. 142. c. 143. c. 144. c. 145. c. 146. c. 147. c. 148. c. 149. c. 150. c. 151. c. 152. c. 153. c. 154. c. 155. c. 156. c. 157. c. 158. c. 159. c. 160. c. 161. c. 162. c. 163. c. 164. c. 165. c. 166. c. 167. c. 168. c. 169. c. 170. c. 171. c. 172. c. 173. c. 174. c. 175. c. 176. c. 177. c. 178. c. 179. c. 180. c. 181. c. 182. c. 183. c. 184. c. 185. c. 186. c. 187. c. 188. c. 189. c. 190. c. 191. c. 192. c. 193. c. 194. c. 195. c. 196. c. 197. c. 198. c. 199. c. 200. c. 201. c. 202. c. 203. c. 204. c. 205. c. 206. c. 207. c. 208. c. 209. c. 210. c. 211. c. 212. c. 213. c. 214. c. 215. c. 216. c. 217. c. 218. c. 219. c. 220. c. 221. c. 222. c. 223. c. 224. c. 225. c. 226. c. 227. c. 228. c. 229. c. 230. c. 231. c. 232. c. 233. c. 234. c. 235. c. 236. c. 237. c. 238. c. 239. c. 240. c. 241. c. 242. c. 243. c. 244. c. 245. c. 246. c. 247. c. 248. c. 249. c. 250. c. 251. c. 252. c. 253. c. 254. c. 255. c. 256. c. 257. c. 258. c. 259. c. 260. c. 261. c. 262. c. 263. c. 264. c. 265. c. 266. c. 267. c. 268. c. 269. c. 270. c. 271. c. 272. c. 273. c. 274. c. 275. c. 276. c. 277. c. 278. c. 279. c. 280. c. 281. c. 282. c. 283. c. 284. c. 285. c. 286. c. 287. c. 288. c. 289. c. 290. c. 291. c. 292. c. 293. c. 294. c. 295. c. 296. c. 297. c. 298. c. 299. c. 300. c. 301. c. 302. c. 303. c. 304. c. 305. c. 306. c. 307. c. 308. c. 309. c. 310. c. 311. c. 312. c. 313. c. 314. c. 315. c. 316. c. 317. c. 318. c. 319. c. 320. c. 321. c. 322. c. 323. c. 324. c. 325. c. 326. c. 327. c. 328. c. 329. c. 330. c. 331. c. 332. c. 333. c. 334. c. 335. c. 336. c. 337. c. 338. c. 339. c. 340. c. 341. c. 342. c. 343. c. 344. c. 345. c. 346. c. 347. c. 348. c. 349. c. 350. c. 351. c. 352. c. 353. c. 354. c. 355. c. 356. c. 357. c. 358. c. 359. c. 360. c. 361. c. 362. c. 363. c. 364. c. 365. c. 366. c. 367. c. 368. c. 369. c. 370. c. 371. c. 372. c. 373. c. 374. c. 375. c. 376. c. 377. c. 378. c. 379. c. 380. c. 381. c. 382. c. 383. c. 384. c. 385. c. 386. c. 387. c. 388. c. 389. c. 390. c. 391. c. 392. c. 393. c. 394. c. 395. c. 396. c. 397. c. 398. c. 399. c. 400. c. 401. c. 402. c. 403. c. 404. c. 405. c. 406. c. 407. c. 408. c. 409. c. 410. c. 411. c. 412. c. 413. c. 414. c. 415. c. 416. c. 417. c. 418. c. 419. c. 420. c. 421. c. 422. c. 423. c. 424. c. 425. c. 426. c. 427. c. 428. c. 429. c. 430. c. 431. c. 432. c. 433. c. 434. c. 435. c. 436. c. 437. c. 438. c. 439. c. 440. c. 441. c. 442. c. 443. c. 444. c. 445. c. 446. c. 447. c. 448. c. 449. c. 450. c. 451. c. 452. c. 453. c. 454. c. 455. c. 456. c. 457. c. 458. c. 459. c. 460. c. 461. c. 462. c. 463. c. 464. c. 465. c. 466. c. 467. c. 468. c. 469. c. 470. c. 471. c. 472. c. 473. c. 474. c. 475. c. 476. c. 477. c. 478. c. 479. c. 480. c. 481. c. 482. c. 483. c. 484. c. 485. c. 486. c. 487. c. 488. c. 489. c. 490. c. 491. c. 492. c. 493. c. 494. c. 495. c. 496. c. 497. c. 498. c. 499. c. 500. c. 501. c. 502. c. 503. c. 504. c. 505. c. 506. c. 507. c. 508. c. 509. c. 510. c. 511. c. 512. c. 513. c. 514. c. 515. c. 516. c. 517. c. 518. c. 519. c. 520. c. 521. c. 522. c. 523. c. 524. c. 525. c. 526. c. 527. c. 528. c. 529. c. 530. c. 531. c. 532. c. 533. c. 534. c. 535. c. 536. c. 537. c. 538. c. 539. c. 540. c. 541. c. 542. c. 543. c. 544. c. 545. c. 546. c. 547. c. 548. c. 549. c. 550. c. 551. c. 552. c. 553. c. 554. c. 555. c. 556. c. 557. c. 558. c. 559. c. 560. c. 561. c. 562. c. 563. c. 564. c. 565. c. 566. c. 567. c. 568. c. 569. c. 570. c. 571. c. 572. c. 573. c. 574. c. 575. c. 576. c. 577. c. 578. c. 579. c. 580. c. 581. c. 582. c. 583. c. 584. c. 585. c. 586. c. 587. c. 588. c. 589. c. 590. c. 591. c. 592. c. 593. c. 594. c. 595. c. 596. c. 597. c. 598. c. 599. c. 600. c. 601. c. 602. c. 603. c. 604. c. 605. c. 606. c. 607. c. 608. c. 609. c. 610. c. 611. c. 612. c. 613. c. 614. c. 615. c. 616. c. 617. c. 618. c. 619. c. 620. c. 621. c. 622. c. 623. c. 624. c. 625. c. 626. c. 627. c. 628. c. 629. c. 630. c. 631. c. 632. c. 633. c. 634. c. 635. c. 636. c. 637. c. 638. c. 639. c. 640. c. 641. c. 642. c. 643. c. 644. c. 645. c. 646. c. 647. c. 648. c. 649. c. 650. c. 651. c. 652. c. 653. c. 654. c. 655. c. 656. c. 657. c. 658. c. 659. c. 660. c. 661. c. 662. c. 663. c. 664. c. 665. c. 666. c. 667. c. 668. c. 669. c. 670. c. 671. c. 672. c. 673. c. 674. c. 675. c. 676. c. 677. c. 678. c. 679. c. 680. c. 681. c. 682. c. 683. c. 684. c. 685. c. 686. c. 687. c. 688. c. 689. c. 690. c. 691. c. 692. c. 693. c. 694. c. 695. c. 696. c. 697. c. 698. c. 699. c. 700. c. 701. c. 702. c. 703. c. 704. c. 705. c. 706. c. 707. c. 708. c. 709. c. 710. c. 711. c. 712. c. 713. c. 714. c. 715. c. 716. c. 717. c. 718. c. 719. c. 720. c. 721. c. 722. c. 723. c. 724. c. 725. c. 726. c. 727. c. 728. c. 729. c. 730. c. 731. c. 732. c. 733. c. 734. c. 735. c. 736. c. 737. c. 738. c. 739. c. 740. c. 741. c. 742. c. 743. c. 744. c. 745. c. 746. c. 747. c. 748. c. 749. c. 750. c. 751. c. 752. c. 753. c. 754. c. 755. c. 756. c. 757. c. 758. c. 759. c. 760. c. 761. c. 762. c. 763. c. 764. c. 765. c. 766. c. 767. c. 768. c. 769. c. 770. c. 771. c. 772. c. 773. c. 774. c. 775. c. 776. c. 777. c. 778. c. 779. c. 780. c. 781. c. 782. c. 783. c. 784. c. 785. c. 786. c. 787. c. 788. c. 789. c. 790. c. 791. c. 792. c. 793. c. 794. c. 795. c. 796. c. 797. c. 798. c. 799. c. 800. c. 801. c. 802. c. 803. c. 804. c. 805. c. 806. c. 807. c. 808. c. 809. c. 810. c. 811. c. 812. c. 813. c. 814. c. 815. c. 816. c. 817. c. 818. c. 819. c. 820. c. 821. c. 822. c. 823. c. 824. c. 825. c. 826. c. 827. c. 828. c. 829. c. 830. c. 831. c. 832. c. 833. c. 834. c. 835. c. 836. c. 837. c. 838. c. 839. c. 840. c. 841. c. 842. c. 843. c. 844. c. 845. c. 846. c. 847. c. 848. c. 849. c. 850. c. 851. c. 852. c. 853. c. 854. c. 855. c. 856. c. 857. c. 858. c. 859. c. 860. c. 861. c. 862. c. 863. c. 864. c. 865. c. 866. c. 867. c. 868. c. 869. c. 870. c. 871. c. 872. c. 873. c. 874. c. 875. c. 876. c. 877. c. 878. c. 879. c. 880. c. 881. c. 882. c. 883. c. 884. c. 885. c. 886. c. 887. c. 888. c. 889. c. 890. c. 891. c. 892. c. 893. c. 894. c. 895. c. 896. c. 897. c. 898. c. 899. c. 900. c. 901. c. 902. c. 903. c. 904. c. 905. c. 906. c. 907. c. 908. c. 909. c. 910. c. 911. c. 912. c. 913. c. 914. c. 915. c. 916. c. 917. c. 918. c. 919. c. 920. c. 921. c. 922. c. 923. c. 924. c. 925. c. 926. c. 927. c. 928. c. 929. c. 930. c. 931. c. 932. c. 933. c. 934. c. 935. c. 936. c. 937. c. 938. c. 939. c. 940. c. 941. c. 942. c. 943. c. 944. c. 945. c. 946. c. 947. c. 948. c. 949. c. 950. c. 951. c. 952. c. 953. c. 954. c. 955. c. 956. c. 957. c. 958. c. 959. c. 960. c. 961. c. 962. c. 963. c. 964. c. 965. c. 966. c. 967. c. 968. c. 969. c. 970. c. 971. c. 972. c. 973. c. 974. c. 975. c. 976. c. 977. c. 978. c. 979. c. 980. c. 981. c. 982. c. 983. c. 984. c. 985. c. 986. c. 987. c. 988. c. 989. c. 990. c. 991. c. 992. c. 993. c. 994. c. 995. c. 996. c. 997. c. 998. c. 999. c. 1000. c. 1001. c. 1002. c. 1003. c. 1004. c. 1005. c. 1006. c. 1007. c. 1008. c. 1009. c. 1010. c. 1011. c. 1012. c. 1013. c. 1014. c. 1015. c. 1016. c. 1017. c. 1018. c. 1019. c. 1020. c. 1021. c. 1022. c. 1023. c. 1024. c. 1025. c. 1026. c. 1027. c. 1028. c. 1029. c. 1030. c. 1031. c. 1032. c. 1033. c. 1034. c. 1035. c. 1036. c. 1037. c. 1038. c. 1039. c. 1040. c. 1041. c. 1042. c. 1043. c. 1044. c. 1045. c. 1046. c. 1047. c. 1048. c. 1049. c. 1050. c. 1051. c. 1052. c. 1053. c. 1054. c. 1055. c. 1056. c. 1057. c. 1058. c. 1059. c. 1060. c. 1061. c. 1062. c. 1063. c. 1064. c. 1065. c. 1066. c. 1067. c. 1068. c. 1069. c. 1070. c. 1071. c. 1072. c. 1073. c. 1074. c. 1075. c. 1076. c. 1077. c. 1078. c. 1079. c. 1080. c. 1081. c. 1082. c. 1083. c. 1084. c. 1085. c. 1086. c. 1087. c. 1088. c. 1089. c. 1090. c. 1091. c. 1092. c. 1093. c. 1094. c. 1095. c. 1096. c. 1097. c. 1098. c. 1099. c. 1100. c. 1101. c. 1102. c. 1103. c. 1104. c. 1105. c. 1106. c. 1107. c. 1108. c. 1109. c. 1110. c. 1111. c. 1112. c. 1113. c. 1114. c. 1115. c. 1116. c. 1117. c. 1118. c. 1119. c. 1120. c. 1121. c. 1122. c. 1123. c. 1124. c. 1125. c. 1126. c. 1127. c. 1128. c. 1129. c. 1130. c. 1131. c. 1132. c. 1133. c. 1134. c. 1135. c. 1136. c. 1137. c. 1138. c. 1139. c. 1140. c. 1141. c. 1142. c. 1143. c. 1144. c. 1145. c. 1146. c. 1147. c. 1148. c. 1149. c. 1150. c. 1151. c. 1152. c. 1153. c. 1154. c. 1155. c. 1156. c. 1157. c. 1158. c. 1159. c. 1160. c. 1161. c. 1162. c. 1163. c. 1164. c. 1165. c. 1166. c. 1167. c. 1168. c. 1169. c. 1170. c. 1171. c. 1172. c. 1173. c. 1174. c. 1175. c. 1176. c. 1177. c. 1178. c. 1179. c. 1180. c. 1181. c. 1182. c. 1183. c. 1184. c. 1185. c. 1186. c. 1187. c. 1188. c. 1189. c. 1190. c. 1191. c. 1192. c. 1193. c. 1194. c. 1195. c. 1196. c. 1197. c. 1198. c. 1199. c. 1200. c. 1201. c. 1202. c. 1203. c. 1204. c. 1205. c. 1206. c. 1207. c. 1208. c. 1209. c. 1210. c. 1211. c. 1212. c. 1213. c. 1214. c. 1215. c. 1216. c. 1217. c. 1218. c. 1219. c. 1220. c. 1221. c. 1222. c. 1223. c. 1224. c. 1225. c. 1226. c. 1227. c. 1228. c. 1229. c. 1230. c. 1231. c. 1232. c. 1233. c. 1234. c. 1235. c. 1236. c. 1237. c. 1238. c. 1239. c. 1240. c. 1241. c. 1242. c. 1243. c. 1244. c. 1245. c. 1246. c. 1247. c. 1248. c. 1249. c. 1250. c. 1251. c. 1252. c. 1253. c. 1254. c. 1255. c. 1256. c. 1257. c. 1258. c. 1259. c. 1260. c. 1261. c. 1262. c. 1263. c. 1264. c. 1265. c. 1266. c. 1267. c. 1268. c. 1269. c. 1270. c. 1271. c. 1272. c. 1273. c. 1274. c. 1275. c. 1276. c. 1277. c. 1278. c. 1279. c. 1280. c. 1281. c. 1282. c. 1283. c. 1284. c. 1285. c. 1286. c. 1287. c. 1288. c. 1289. c. 1290. c. 1291. c. 1292. c. 1293. c. 1294. c. 1295. c. 1296. c. 1297. c. 1298. c. 1299. c. 1300. c. 1301. c. 1302. c. 1303. c. 1304. c. 1305. c. 1306. c. 1307. c. 1308. c. 1309. c. 1310. c. 1311. c. 1312. c. 1313. c. 1314. c. 1315. c. 1316. c. 1317. c. 1318. c. 1319. c. 1320. c. 1321. c. 1322. c. 1323. c. 1324. c. 1325. c. 1326. c. 1327. c. 1328. c. 1329. c. 1330. c. 1331. c. 1332. c. 1333. c. 1334. c. 1335. c. 1336. c. 1337. c. 1338. c. 1339. c. 1340. c. 1341. c. 1342. c. 1343. c. 1344. c. 1345. c. 1346. c. 1347. c. 1348. c. 1349. c. 1350. c. 1351. c. 1352. c. 1353. c. 1354. c. 1355. c. 1356. c. 1357. c. 1358. c. 1359. c. 1360. c. 1361. c. 1362. c. 1363. c. 1364. c. 1365. c. 1366. c. 1367. c. 1368. c. 1369. c. 1370. c. 1371. c. 1372. c. 1373. c. 1374. c. 1375. c. 1376. c. 1377. c. 1378. c. 1379. c. 1380. c. 1381. c. 1382. c. 1383. c. 1384. c. 1385. c. 1386. c. 1387. c. 1388. c. 1389. c. 1390. c. 1391. c. 1392. c. 1393. c. 1394. c. 1395. c. 1396. c. 1397. c. 1398. c. 1399. c. 1400. c. 1401. c. 1402. c. 1403. c. 1404. c. 1405. c. 1406. c. 1407. c. 1408. c. 1409. c. 1410. c. 1411. c. 1412. c. 1413. c. 1414. c. 1415. c. 1416. c. 1417. c. 1418. c. 1419. c. 1420. c. 1421. c. 1422. c. 1423. c. 1424. c. 1425. c. 1426. c. 1427. c. 1428. c. 1429. c. 1430. c. 1431. c. 1432. c. 1433. c. 1434. c. 1435. c. 1436. c. 1437. c. 1438. c. 1439. c. 1440. c. 1441. c. 1442. c. 1443. c. 1444. c. 1445. c. 1446. c. 1447. c. 1448. c. 1449. c. 1450. c. 1451. c. 1452. c. 1453. c. 1454. c. 1455. c. 1456. c. 1457. c. 1458. c. 1459. c. 1460. c. 1461. c. 1462. c. 1463. c. 1464. c. 1465. c. 1466. c. 1467. c. 1468. c. 1469. c. 1470. c. 1471. c. 1472. c. 1473. c. 1474. c. 1475. c. 1476. c. 1477. c. 1478. c. 1479. c. 1480. c. 1481. c. 1482. c. 1483. c. 1484. c. 1485. c. 1486. c. 1487. c. 1488. c. 1489. c. 1490. c. 1491. c. 1492. c. 1493. c. 1494. c. 1495. c. 1496. c. 1497. c. 1498. c. 1499. c. 1500. c. 1501. c. 1502. c. 1503. c. 1504. c. 1505. c. 1506. c. 1507. c. 1508. c. 1509. c. 1510. c. 1511. c. 1512. c. 1513. c. 1514. c. 1515. c. 1516. c. 1517. c. 1518. c. 1519. c. 1520. c. 1521. c. 1522. c. 1523. c. 1524. c. 1525. c. 1526. c. 1527. c. 1528. c. 1529. c. 1530. c. 1531. c. 1532. c. 1533. c. 1534. c. 1535. c. 1536. c. 1537. c. 1538. c. 1539. c. 1540. c. 1541. c. 1542. c. 1543. c. 1544. c. 1545. c. 1546. c. 1547. c. 1548. c. 1549. c. 1550. c. 1551. c. 1552. c. 1553. c. 1554. c. 1555. c. 1556. c. 1557. c. 1558. c. 1559. c. 1560. c. 1561. c. 1562. c. 1563. c. 1564. c. 1565. c. 1566. c. 1567. c. 1568. c. 1569. c. 1570. c. 1571. c. 1572. c. 1573. c. 1574. c. 1575. c. 1576. c. 1577. c. 1578. c. 1579. c. 1580. c. 1581. c. 1582. c. 1583. c. 1584. c. 1585. c. 1586. c. 1587. c. 1588. c. 1589. c. 1590. c. 1591. c. 1592. c. 1593. c. 1594. c. 1595. c. 1596. c. 1597. c. 1598. c. 1599. c.*

Which is as true, as that I came in to his shop, & this night. When I saw that in Italick, *crypa* and *styua* are all one. I supposed it had been the assertion of Mr. Hobbs and my self, and that he had therefore put a different character, because the sentence was not his. After a strict enquiry into what Mr. Hobbs had delivered, I could not find any such thing: that *styua* doth simply signifie a mark, he confesses; that *crypa* signifies a point visible (which is a kinde of) mark, he doth likewise grant. He doth further say, that it is *no less proper to say that crypa is a mark* (a certain mark is a mark; and *indefinitum aequivalere particulari*) with an hot-iron, then to say the same of *styua*, (which is also a certain mark.) These are the things he says, and if he said any more, or what might contradict these, I am confident I never came in to his shop; and the Doctor hath acquitted me in the next page (though he would not in this) p. 44. 'If I understand him, he was alwayes of opinion that *crypa* and *styua* were not all one.

I have further examined my own Letter, to see what grounds he could have there to urge upon me such a proposition; as he had evident reasons from my own positive assertion, to pronounce, that I was alwayes of another judgment. The only places that might give him occasion to say so, are these two: The first, where I say, 'that *styua* is sometimes all one with *crypa*, which he might have found in Stephen, although 'he could not find in him any example whereby to prove the use of *crypa* for *styua*. This I did then shew out of Hesiod: which place I would have so far considered, as that we forget not how the Scholiast expounding *styua* by *crypa* can hardly be understood to continue or explain obscurity for obscurity, the usual acceptance of *styua* by taking *crypa* in a more ancient and improper sense: It seems therefore highly probable that in the Scholiast's time the use of *crypa* for a visible point, was allowable (such as are the Spots upon Dragons, in which sense *crypa* and *styua* are frequently used one only by Oppian, but also Aristophanes, as your picti Agathos, picti Geloni, virgati Daks in Latin,) and the use of *styua* in that sense, for *crypa* is demonstrated. And consequently as the Master bids the boy remember the difference between *styua* and *crypa*; so I may justly desire the Doctor to shew out the difference in that place of Hesiod. But all this doth not give him cause to say that *crypa* and *styua* are essence. The next place is where I say (not to the Doctor but reader) that *crypa* is used for a burning with an hot-iron. But from hence he could not infer that I said *crypa* and *styua* were all one: for, I have already shewed how both might be used to signifie a burning with an hot-iron, and yet they might retain their specificall significations still, and so continue differenced. And secondly had I taken there *crypa* for *styua* (as I did) signifying a brand with an hot-iron, yet it would not from such an use of the word be inferred, that they were simply all one: but that in the places cited they were so: which is but word it, not essence. Now all that I told the reader (to shew there was no such vast irreconcilable difference betwixt the two words) was That *crypa* is used for a burning with an hot-iron. By this time you see not onely what Mr. Hobbs, and what I said, but also what credit is to be given to the Doctor. Now I come to examine what the Doctor hath brought by way of exception against the proofe Mr. Hobbs, and I brought for such acceptance of the word.

My argument was this, 'that *crypa* was descended from *crē*, which signified to mark with an hot-iron, or the like: therefore such originally must be the signification of *crypa*: (this doth not amount to a confounding it with *styua*.) and though we had no examples of such use of the word, yet the reason was not thereupon to be denied, but by him who could thinke that no word hath lost its right signification, and is used onely (by the Authors we have, although neither the Doctor nor I have read all them) in its Analogicall signification. This I shall not now doubt to call (as Salmasius doth the like upon every occasion) *Terminum adfectum*. This is the

negligently, because that another way was not then in use; nor a long time after the decay of the Roman Empire: they did *matticulate* Souldiers, and brand them first with Iron, and after insulse with a Stylus or the like, a thick gross sort of Ink: which was thereupon called *μύλας καυτήν*, *δι' ἧς ὁ σὺλῶς αἰς τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀντὶ τοῦ μύλας καυτῆτος* Cedren: not that the brand was performed by pricking, but because it was afterwards so pointed with Ink, because that they had learn'd a way of taking them out otherwise.

Stigmata nec vasfr̄ doloibz Cinnamus aris.

He adds further, that *στυμαί* (In the plural) are used as equipollent to one *χαράκτηρ* (in the singular.) But this conjecture must not overthrow my opinion, since there were more *στυμαί* than one imprinted: yea more *stigmata*, as upon the Hand, Back, Shoulder, &c. And this was not only the practice of the *Affrian* (and *Egyptian*) Priests; and *Thracians*, (where it was honourable) but *Grecians* and *Romans*: (as every one knowes) and even a But could not the Doctor have found a more easie and obvious interpretation, that they had all but one *χαράκτηρ*, or mark to shew whose servants they were; but they had several *στυμαί* *τῶν σιμαίων*, upon their bodies. But it is further observable that *Isidorus Orig.* l. 20. c. 16. speaking of *insignium equorum*, where it was most requisite for him to fix the terms of art upon their right significations, saith *χαράκτηρ*, Character, est *ferrum insigne*, quo nota pecudibus immittuntur. The mark it self is called by *Anacreon* *πυγὲς χαράκτηρ*, *Hesychius* calls them *σημαία*.

Now follows *Zonaras*, whose two texts compared together do sufficiently evince; that what he meant by *μύλας*: by *χαυτὴν τῶν στυμαίων*, he intended by *τῶν στυμαίων μύλας* *ἐντὶ τοῦ*. In both places he speaks of more then one, and therefore *τῶν στυμαίων* is not necessarily restrained to signify the prick; and in the same text he seemed to me, (not to me only, but also to *Lipsius*) to render *στυμαί* by *στυμαία*. There is no mark made on hot iron: it is right, but that is presumed, as in *Rhodogigas*, when he explains *stigmata* by *αἰς ἰνστυ*. But the Doctor can construe Greek! *τὰς ἑλπίδας ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡσυχίου* [he made points or prick in their faces] *ἐν τῶν στυμαίων μύλας ἐντὶ τοῦ* (and put ink, upon these pricks) *γέγραμμεν ὅτι ἐν τῶν στυμαίων* (the *στυμαία*, or characters which consisted of those *στυμαί*, made so many letters) *τὰ ὅτι ἰαμβοὶ ὡς* (which *Lipsius* calls up these *Lambicks*.) After this exposition (you see the Doctor can not only *glaze* upon a *Tim.* 2. 15. he can make a *Mise of Wax* of other Books too) the Doctor asks, *What serves all this to prove?* Answer, that it still proves that *στυμαί* might be made without *arbut iron* (if these marks were so imprinted.) But why doth he render *στυμαί* by he pricked them in the face? Is that the signification of the word? can he shew an example of that use of it? Is there any other term in Greek for to signify to brand, then *στυμαί*, that is more usual? is it not taken for a *Synonyma* with *ἐντὶ τοῦ*, *ἐντὶ τοῦ*, *ἐντὶ τοῦ*, *ἐντὶ τοῦ*? Is it not still expounded by the *Latins* *inure*, *inscribo*, *inure* compungo? I know not what might occasion him so to render it, unless because I had taught him the difference betwixt *στυμαί* and *στυμαία*, was like that of *γέγραμμεν* and *γέγραμμεν*; he like a bad Scholar imagines the *stigmata* to have been made up of actual points: (yes! *Comma's*, and *Colon's*!) just as a Letter (in ordinary speech, for I do not now intend to dispute *Philosophically*) is supposed to be made up of actual lines! which is not true of many, and where it is, that is not the thing begets the appellation, but the concept we have thereof. Either it must have been so; or that *Latin* phrase *notis compungit* hath deceived him! for that expression may be verified of your *Sheep* or *Horseflocks*. I finde, also, *stigmata* *puncti* in *Parvus*: from whence I may conclude, in the Doctor's way, that *stigma* was but a point. There remains nothing but that the Author of that interpretation urges that *confessio* is to run through with a Spade: and *στυμαί* to prick with a Needle, or the like in *Appian*, and *Zosimus*, and *Lucianus* several times

stick Letters, but take his length from my measure; and not trouble the world, nor per-
 stir his bookes with curiosities in Philology, nor intermeddle with Divinity, but con-
 fine himself to *Symbols*, wherein he may do well it is hoped in time, and he will have
 that happiness to meet with as few *Readers* as he doth *Auditors*. I would advise him
 to call Mr. *Hobbs* his book, *Stigma Hobbianum*, rather then *Trypan*, since all the sever-
 al points therein discussed and examined amount but to one *Stigma*: which I here re-
 present. K. I. K. I. And so dismiss him as one of the *LITERATI*, though not as a
Virtuoso.

Thus Sir you see I have vindicated my self, and you, or rather my self as you: I have
 dealt so with your enemy, that I dare take up the saying of *Petronius*, *Implesi frontem*
ingeniibus literis, *ex notum epigramma per totam faciem liberali manu duxi*. I hope you will
 prove hereafter more cautious, then to publish any thing in *Philology*, since *Martianus*
Capella hath left his *Mistresse double-beneficed* to the Assembly of *Divines*: and no one
 is to pretend to *Criticisme* or any thing of learning but such as are of that *Classe*: if any
 man shall presume to call another so, or have any esteem for them, or make honourable
 mention of them, there shall be aspersions cast upon him, and an *Index expurgatorius*,
 whereby shall be blotted out all those honourable mentions of any *disseminator*: In like
 manner as their Predecessour, the *Pope* (the power is the same whether divided, or uni-
 ted) expunged the titles of *doctus*, and *eruditus* out of the *Catholick* writers where they
 were bestowed upon the *Protestants*. I shall now conclude with the divertisement of
 some Poetry, the Authors whereof I am not bound to declare; and desire you would
 finde out some other way hereafter, whereby I may shew you how much I am and de-
 sire to be

Oxon. Jun. 12.
 1657.

Sir, your most humble and most
 affectionate Servant,

H. Stubbe.

Ad Honoratissimum virum, Marchionem Dorcestrensem
Super scriptis nuperis Wallisianis.

Hendecasyllabon.

Hæc maxime, maximæque litis
Major arbiter, Oxoni verostas
Obsolescere nē Scholas putaris,
Aut loci Genium, aut Styli *decorum*
Mutatum *crepero* sene vocem
Peronomasii, ineptisq̃ue
Scriptores alios dabit * *Calenum*
Dignos *auribus*, Hunc tuo *cachinnu*
Propinat *Criticum*, Geometramq̃ue:
Quem nemo legit, aut requirit usquam,
Quem vix *quaritur* audiunt *legentem*:
Quia loquar bene nota, saepe in ipsa
Solum friget *Orationis* cathedra,
Nepes, *entern*, *advens*, *Scitiffe*,
Plenus raris & infestiarum.
Quovis iudicio refuge, damna
Improbam *Crisin*, haud probam *Mathesin*;
Frons *Huic* STIGMATE, nostra non notatur.

* *Oxonia.*

Ad D. Wallisium Epigramma.

Ringeris, & totū spargis convictis plebe,
Defensor nostræ quod videre *Sua*.
Erras! responsum, si forte *Academia* laesa est,
Quam male concinnas, efficit esse *Tuum*.

FINIS.